

Mr. PETTIGREW. I move that the Senate adjourn.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota to have a message from the House of Representatives laid before the Senate?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will yield for that purpose.

#### LOOSE LOGS AND RAFTS ON RIVERS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9824) authorizing the Secretary of War to make regulations governing the running of loose logs, steamboats, and rafts on certain rivers and streams and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. NELSON. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. NELSON, Mr. McMILLAN; and Mr. BERRY were appointed.

#### MILITARY OFFICERS IN CUBA AND PORTO RICO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 21st instant, certain information relative to whether any officer of the Army of the United States who is now, or who has been, on duty either in Cuba or Porto Rico since the date of the declaration of war by the United States against Spain has received any compensation for any service of any kind whatsoever other than the compensation to which such officer of the Army is, as such, entitled by law to receive as his salary and allowance, etc.

If there be no objection, the communication will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and printed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let it lie on the table.

Mr. BACON. Let it lie on the table, if you please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the communication will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota moves—

Mr. PETTIGREW. I renew my motion, then, to adjourn.

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for the purpose of making the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 26, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 25, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a matter of privilege. I hold in my hand the certification of the result of a special election held in the State of Utah on the 2d day of this month for Representative in this Congress. The gentleman bearing the certificate is present, the Hon. William H. King, who has heretofore served with many of us in the House of Representatives, and I ask that the certificate, which appears to be regular in form and issued by the proper authority, be read, and that the gentleman be sworn in as a member of this House from the State of Utah.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the credentials.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

I, James T. Hammond, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that on Monday, the 2d day of April, A. D. 1900, at the special election held within and for said State, William H. King was duly elected Representative to the Fifty-sixth Congress of the United States of America from the State of Utah, as appears from the returns of said election, which have been duly canvassed and certified.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 20th day of April, A. D. 1900.

[SEAL.]

J. T. HAMMOND, Secretary of State.

Mr. King thereupon appeared at the bar and the oath was administered to him by the Speaker. [Applause.]

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. DALZELL in the Chair, for the further consideration of

the bill H. R. 10301, making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I understood we had reached the pneumatic-tube proposition when we adjourned. I will inquire of the Clerk what part of the bill he is reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had just finished the pneumatic-tube paragraph yesterday.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It was agreed, Mr. Chairman, that we should have two hours' debate upon this paragraph.

Mr. LOUD. The parliamentary status was that the Clerk had completed the reading of the pneumatic-tube paragraph, and a point of order was made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE], which was pending when the House adjourned, as the RECORD shows.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that at the request of several members who oppose this paragraph I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas withdraws his point of order. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] to control the two hours set apart for debate on this paragraph.

Mr. MOON. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, in the beginning of this debate I will say that in my view of the postal service none of us desire to oppose any practical measure which will materially contribute to facilitate the mail service in the United States; but I believe that we can do that service insufferable harm by permitting certain projects and systems to be ingrafted upon the postal service which will prove an embargo on the service and bankrupt the service, as far as that is concerned.

Now, this pneumatic-tube service, in my opinion, contributes to facilitate the mail in such a small degree as to render its continuation or enlargement not the best thing to do. We have already 8.5 miles of this service, as I remember, and we are paying for that service annually a rental of \$37,250 a mile.

After long and continuous hearings before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and carefully considering that testimony, I have been unable to find from that testimony where it materially facilitates the transportation of the mail. I find that in the passage of the mail where these tubes are established, say a distance of a mile, the wagon service is continued, and the wagon will make the trip in twenty minutes, as often as the service requires. It is claimed at some places that it facilitates the mail ten minutes, others fifteen minutes, twenty minutes, and the largest is thirty-five minutes. The truth is that when the mail is first received at the depot, they can begin to send it to the principal office, and the first delivery of the tubes will arrive there a considerable time before the wagon mail could. But the wagon can deliver the mail in from ten to twenty minutes at almost every station in the service.

If the Government be called upon to continue to pay the enormous prices it is now paying for this service, I believe it to be an outrage on the people and a disgrace to the service. Take the city of New York; in that city alone we are paying to-day for an 8-inch metal tube buried in the ground a rate of \$37,738 per mile per annum rent. Now, that tube ought to be put in the ground for \$2 a foot, which would be an enormous price for the laying of these pipes. And yet we are paying the enormous price, on an average, of \$22,500 per mile, or \$225,000 a year for 8.5 miles of this service. The service does not undertake to handle the paper mail, nothing outside of the first-class matter, and handles only about 80 per cent of that. But little of the paper or bulk mail ever sees these tubes. There is no material decrease in the wagon service.

Yet we are called upon to pay this price, which, if we extend the service throughout the cities of the country, will amount to untold millions, and, in my opinion, will not very materially facilitate the service. I believe the time has come when Congress ought to take a backward step on this proposition, if it can be called a backward step. It is a step in the direction of economic and honest administration of postal facilities. I believe, nay, I am sure, we ought to strike the appropriation from this bill. I believe that in doing this we shall relieve the mail service from a fungus growth that promises to bankrupt that service.

It is claimed that the use of this service will increase the amount of first-class matter. A similar claim is made on every proposition. It is advanced by the friends of second-class mail matter; it is claimed as one of the results of rural free delivery. The advocates of each scheme in its turn claim that the adoption of that particular scheme will largely increase the revenues of the Department.

Legislation adopted by Congress in 1898 provided that no additional appropriation should be made to extend this service until

authorized by law. In view of that provision of law, I interposed yesterday a point of order against this provision of the pending bill; but the opponents of this service, as well as its friends, believed it ought to be discussed in this House, so that the judgment of the House might be obtained upon it, and for this reason I withdrew the point of order. But if appropriations for this purpose are to be continued, I believe we ought to strike this appropriation from the bill and provide for the service by general legislation in such a way that the interests of the Government may be properly guarded and the expense of the service properly limited. But, under the present circumstances, to pay the sum of \$27,000 a mile on a general average, or \$37,000 a mile in some cities, for the use of this service is, I believe, an extravagance which we can not be justified in supporting.

I am willing to extend to the cities and the towns, as well as to the people of the country districts, every reasonable facility for handling their mails; but I can not justify myself in supporting this measure for the benefit of places which already have deliveries six, eight, or nine times a day.

If the apparatus for carrying on this service was a great expensive machine, greatly facilitating the mails, we might justify ourselves in some degree for this large expenditure; but this service requires, as I understand, simply a cast-iron pipe—I presume it is cast iron—8 inches in diameter and laid in the ground as you would lay a water pipe. To charge for a service requiring this simple machinery \$37,000 a mile, or \$225,000 for 8 miles, is, I believe, wholly unjustifiable. I do not believe this measure facilitates transportation of the mails in any degree comparable with the price demanded. If Congress wants to go farther in this direction, I believe we ought to call a halt on appropriations of this kind and adopt general legislation on this subject, to the end that the interests of the Government may be subserved and the service be properly cared for. I hope the appropriation will be denied.

Mr. Chairman, I return the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. MOON. I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] will now use some of his time.

Mr. LOUD. If anyone on this side wants time, I am perfectly willing to yield it, but at present I have no applicants for time, and when I talk myself it will be to conclude the debate.

Mr. MOON. Then I will yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. LOUD. I find there is a gentleman on our side who desires to occupy some time. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the pneumatic-tube service is of particular interest, in the first instance, to the cities. Yesterday the House passed an item of \$1,750,000 for the purpose of extending the rural free delivery. To that I make no objection. If it is possible to carry out that experiment in such a way as will conduce to the best interests of the Government and the people, so that we may have free rural delivery in various parts of the country or throughout the country, I shall be in favor of it.

But I want to call the attention of those gentlemen who are interested in rural free delivery to the fact that it is paid for by the receipts of the city post-offices. In no place where rural free delivery has been put in operation do the receipts pay the expenditures for that service, not to mention the other expenses in connection with the mail matter.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the city which I in part represent the postal receipts turned in to the Government as net receipts exceed several million dollars. In 1891 the receipts at the post-office in Chicago were \$3,126,000. Last year they amounted to \$6,352,000, having more than doubled in eight years; and nearly or more than one-half of this \$6,000,000 was net receipts turned in to the Government for the general use of the Post-Office Department. It is true that a large share of that money is used for the expedition of mails by railroad routes and elsewhere; but it is also true that the cities turn in net revenues, which are used for the benefit of the rural districts in the expedition of the mails; and I insist it is only fair that in the experiments being made by the Post-Office Department those cities which turn in such vast amounts of revenue should have their share in the results of the experiments.

It is probably true that the pneumatic-tube service is more or less an experiment. I can not speak of that service in Boston, New York, or Philadelphia, but I know that in the city of Chicago it would be of great benefit, not only to the people, but to the service itself. And as I understand it, sir, it is not the purpose, if this item should be passed in the bill and any portion of it is set aside for use in the city of Chicago, it is not the purpose to use the service for the transmission of the mails between the main post-office and the various railroad depots in the city. Chicago is so situated with reference to the depots of the main lines of the railroads centering there that most of the depots are but a comparatively short distance from the main post-office of the city, and it may be true that this would not very much expedite the

transmission of the mails between the post-office and the railway stations in that city; but it is also true that the great city of Chicago, covering a vast territory as it does, has many local centers where immense business interests are carried on, where vast interests are concentrated.

I might mention, or call the attention of the committee to the fact, that a vast business is transacted at the Union Stock Yards at Chicago, which has its own postal station. It now takes from one to two hours to transmit mail from the general post-office to the stock yards or from the stock yards back to the general office. If the pneumatic-tube system were inaugurated there and operated, the transmission of first-class mails would necessarily be greatly expedited between these points. It would be of immense value to the people doing business at the yards and with the city of Chicago, as well as those persons connected with that business in the surrounding country, because it must be remembered that these stock yards represent a very large amount of the business interests in the Western country—the Western farms and the farmers as well as the business men generally of the Western country—and it is to their interest that the mails shall be transmitted with as much expedition as possible between these points.

I might also cite the fact that the banking interests are largely collected in the center of the city, and other business facilities, to a large extent, are concentrated at the central points in the city, and it is necessary for the proper transaction of the business that the mails shall be expedited so that a letter can go from the general post-office to the stock yards and to other local centers in the city and an answer back again in a short time, not exceeding, say, a half hour, where, as now, it sometimes takes a day, and not infrequently a day and a night to perform the journey.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, therefore, that while the Post-Office Department is making some of these experiments for the purpose of adding to the expedition of the mails in rural districts, it might be well to enact a provision by which the pneumatic-tube service could be put in operation in the great city of Chicago, as manifestly so many interests there demand expedition in the mail service.

A few years ago the city of Chicago granted a franchise for the pneumatic-tube service, in connection with the Associated Press of the city of Chicago, to connect it with the various newspaper offices in different parts of the city. At the time it was said by people on the outside, it was said in the city council, of which I happened then to be a member, that it would be of doubtful benefit. I have had a conversation recently with Mr. Addison C. Thomas, the superintendent of the Associated Press in that city, and who has had an extensive connection with that service, who informs me that it has proved of great service to the various newspapers and the Associated Press in the city, in the expediting of the news furnished by the Associated Press, and in the transmission of news to the various newspaper offices. He informed me that in a very short time—almost instantly—they can send news dispatches to or from the newspaper offices in the city. It is very much more expeditious than the telegraph service, because they can handle the business more rapidly than it was formerly done by wire. They transact the business so readily and so rapidly by this system that it would be absolutely impossible to carry on the business satisfactorily without it. The same would be equally true as applied to the business of the Post-Office Department.

It is impossible in the city of Chicago and elsewhere throughout the country, in the larger cities, to send a letter from the general post-office to the outskirts of the city, or even to the inside local centers of the city, within anything like a reasonable time. In our city, which reaches, from end to end, a distance of from 30 to 40 miles, we are absolutely without proper mail facilities or service in this regard. The revenue that we pay for the postal service of Chicago—the immense amount paid annually there—goes for the benefit of other parts of the country instead of our own. Now, why is it not fair that we should have a little of our own revenues to develop our service and provide for the accommodation of our own people?

I will say, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that if these experiments are to be continued in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Brooklyn, it should also be extended to Chicago and to the other large cities of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes now to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, the proposition contained in this bill, and to which the attention of the committee is now directed, is a very innocent looking one. It is of very little importance whether we increase this \$115,000,000 appropriation bill by another half million of dollars, as proposed, or not. But as I took occasion to say recently on the floor of the House, I warn this committee that if we take the step we are asked here to take in connection with the pending bill, that it is not a question of a half million dollars expenditure, or of \$1,000,000, but



that it will be in the future, and the very near future, a question of many millions of dollars annually added to the already swollen expenditures of the Post-Office Department of this country.

When we consider that in the last ten years that great cooperative undertaking of the people has run behind more than \$110,000,000, and when we consider that this bill, for the first time and the first among all appropriation bills, proposes to expend the public money in sums in excess of those demanded by the Post-Office Department, it is our duty to pause long and to consider well before we travel further in the pathway which is proposed to us.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider for a moment what we spend for the transportation of mails. I will not weary the committee by a recital of figures, but I will place them in my remarks in the RECORD.

*For transportation of mails.*

Paid other agencies:	
Star routes	\$5,240,000
Steamboats	545,000
Railroads	33,870,000
Railway post-office cars	4,561,000
Street cars	350,000
Special facilities	196,238
Total	44,762,238
Our own agencies:	
Mail messengers	950,000
Pneumatic tube	725,000
Wagon service	750,000
Railway Mail Service	9,761,300
Total	56,948,538

The bill appropriates, in round numbers, \$57,000,000 for the mere transportation of the mails, without taking into account many items of appropriation for the purchase of material which is used only for that purpose.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman had better segregate the items. He has got that total pretty high.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No; I have not.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If my colleague will permit me, I should like to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman state to the House what the demand for mail facilities is in the United States and how that increase is carried along in comparison with the increased expenses? Let us hear both sides of it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, everybody knows that the demand for the privileges of mailing have increased, and increased greatly, but that does not relieve us from the duty of conducting the business of the Post-Office Department upon business principles.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I crave the attention of the House while I undertake to show how this ill-begotten appropriation began. I think it will be a warning to us to proceed with caution. Let me have your attention for but a few moments upon this proposition.

Mr. LOUD. Has the gentleman any objection to an interruption there?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOUD. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to one of his items in his transportation account, which I do not think the gentleman will hold is a legitimate transportation item. The gentleman is always accurate, but I see he has charged the salaries of the railway mail clerks into the item of transportation, and I do not think those salaries are legitimately chargeable to that.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I know what the gentleman from California has in mind. I recognize the justice of his criticism in that respect. The railway postal clerks are engaged not only in transportation, but to a very large degree in the sorting and distribution of the mails, and so far as that part of my statement is concerned it is fairly subject to the criticism which the gentleman makes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me return to the origin of this appropriation. I trust I may have the attention of both sides of the House to this part of the remarks that I intend to make. Mr. Chairman, it does seem as if there were no sentiment either in this House or out of it in favor of economy in the public expenditures. By and by the representatives of the people and the people themselves will wake up to the abyss toward which we are running. In the last Congress more than one billion five hundred millions of the public moneys were appropriated. Appropriations are increasing upon every side. At the present time there is not a branch of the public service but what is knocking at the doors for an increase in its share of public money.

Now, as to the origin of this particular appropriation. The Post-Office bill for the fiscal year 1893 contained a very innocent provision for an inquiry into the process of transferring mails by pneumatic tube. There was a small appropriation of \$10,000 and a direction that the Postmaster-General should report to Congress upon the subject. Whether he did report or not I do not know.

I have not had the opportunity to find out. But the project remained silent until it appeared in the appropriation bill passed June 9, 1896, and I invite your attention to that date. Upon that date Mr. Wilson was Postmaster-General of the United States and Charles Neilson was the Second Assistant Postmaster-General of the United States. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General controls all transportation questions. In that bill was this appropriation:

The Postmaster-General may, in his discretion, use not exceeding the sum of \$35,000 of this amount in the transportation of mail by pneumatic tube or other similar devices.

Up to that time there had been no appropriation for the pneumatic-tube service. There was a change of administration. Mr. Neilson left the office of Second Assistant Postmaster-General and was succeeded by the able and accomplished gentleman who now holds that office.

I call the attention of the committee to the subsequent history of Mr. Neilson's connection with this enterprise. In the testimony taken by the Postal Commission there is contained the testimony given by Mr. John E. Milholland on the 2d day of August, 1898. He was examined with respect to the question of whether any public men were in any way interested in the pneumatic-tube service. He said:

I also wanted to say in regard to one other public man, Mr. Charles Neilson, that after his retirement as Second Assistant Postmaster-General, he came here and an arrangement was made to have him represent the company at Washington for one year. He was made a director of the company—

That is, the Pneumatic Company of New York—

and was to look after matters at Washington. An arrangement was made for one year, and he was paid for that one year's service a thousand dollars, that being allowed him for traveling expenses, and he was also given \$10,000 of the stock of the company.

Q. How long did this occur after his retirement from office?

Mr. LITTLE. I hope we may have order. I am very desirous of hearing the statement the gentleman has made, and I wish he would repeat it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It is only from a sense of public duty that I speak of these things. It is unpleasant for me to do it, but I do so because I have been charged by this House as a member of the Postal Commission to investigate the question. If the attention of the House could be secured to its consideration, this appropriation would die the death it ought to. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. I will say to the gentleman that if he will smoke the scoundrels out, this side of the House will stay with him.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I was stating that the first appropriation was made when Mr. Neilson was Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under whose administration?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not want to bring any politics into it at all. Within six weeks, at the outside, after he left the office, he was given a thousand dollars in cash and \$10,000 in stock for his services at Washington during the succeeding year. What they were I do not know. What they could properly be I can not guess; but he was given this stock, and the testimony in regard to its value was this:

Q. Has it now an ascertainable market value?

A. The only sale of that stock that I can recall was in the summer; I think the stock was sold at 95 asked and 90 bid.

Mr. BINGHAM. Dollars or cents?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Dollars.

That was the only transaction that I can recall.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me finish just here. I ought in justice to put in this question and answer:

Q. Was any arrangement made with Mr. Neilson at the time he was holding office?

A. None whatever.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What are you reading from?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I am reading from the testimony taken by the Postal Commission, given on the 2d day of August, 1898, the testimony of John E. Milholland, representative of the New York Pneumatic Tube Company.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now may I ask if we can get that report?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I know of no way that the gentleman can get that report except by borrowing it from some member of the commission.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would like to have the whole report.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman is entitled to have the whole report, and I think whatever else the Postal Commission does before this Congress adjourns, it ought to print and put at the disposal of members all the evidence that it has.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. GAINES. What did this man do in this matter, and who employed him down here?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The Pneumatic Tube Company employed him.

Mr. SULZER. Is it not a fact that he is one of the editors of the New York Tribune?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not know whether he is or not, and I do not care whether he is or not.

Mr. SULZER. Well, he is.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That testimony was taken for the use of Congress, and taken in an attempt to remedy the evils which exist in our postal service, and it ought to be submitted to Congress and to the whole American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I hope the gentleman will not say "Congress;" we have been shut out.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman now permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. In view of the fact that the testimony before the commission seems to be, so far as the House is concerned, a sealed book, I would ask how many pages of that testimony pertain to the pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It covers, I would reply, very many pages.

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to ask that it be made a part of the RECORD, in connection with the gentleman's statement. It is pertinent to this debate, and it will be pertinent to the debate in the other Chamber. I think this House is entitled to have it in connection with the gentleman's statement, which I fully credit, and full information upon the subject. We may not have it otherwise until the close of the session, and I think we should have it in connection with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should be very glad that the House should have it, but I should not want to print all this testimony as an appendix to my statement. It would be an abuse of the privileges of the RECORD, an abuse that I have not been guilty of, and I will not abuse it; but as one member of the Postal Commission I will do what I can to present all the testimony to the public and to Congress before the close of this session of Congress.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will allow me, I do not think it would be any abuse of the RECORD. In view of the charge that the gentleman has made, he ought to give the evidence of it to the House.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have made no charge; I make no charge. I trust these facts may be explained consistently with principle of honest conduct on the part of public officials; but I say that these facts call for an explanation, and I say that these facts call upon us to hesitate in going further in this pathway.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman; there was other testimony before the commission. I shall mention no names, and I regret extremely to have to speak upon this subject. But we found that the pneumatic-tube system in New York was constructed by contractors who took their pay in stock and bonds; that the only value which that stock and those bonds had was the contract with the Government. It was certainly unfortunate—I think nothing else, believe nothing else, but unfortunate—it was certainly unfortunate that a holder of the bonds and one of the contractors was a member of this House and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

A MEMBER. Give us his name.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I decline to state.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the report develop that fact?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It does.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman state his name?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will not. As showing the methods employed by the New York company, I will state that a large block of the stock of this company as a New Year's present was sent to a near relative of an important and influential member of the House. I am glad to say that the return mail was not allowed to depart from Washington without carrying back that dishonoring and dishonorable gift. [Applause.]

Before the Post-Office Committee there came a representative of the parent company, who said, "We want to extend it to twenty-seven cities in the Union," and he named them. My friend from Ohio, Mr. BROMWELL, pointed out the coincidence that he had happened to include every member of the committee except my friend from Connecticut, Mr. SPERRY, and I do not know how he happened to be overlooked.

I only quote from the statement of Mr. BROMWELL, and I know nothing more about it than that. If my friend supposes for a moment that I intended that as a reflection upon any member of the committee, or intended to suggest for one moment that anyone was influenced in any degree by that statement, I beg to withdraw it, because no committee in this House holds my respect in a greater degree than the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads; and no man in this House, or out of it, holds my respect for his honesty, his integrity, his courage, every day in the year and in every contingency of his duty, to a greater degree than does the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD]. [Applause.]

We are all of us courageous at times; he is courageous always. We all of us look to our duty at times; he follows it as the compass points to the North Star, and I would not say a word that could be construed to reflect upon him or any of his associates. I would sooner let my tongue wither and drop from my mouth than do that.

Mr. LOUD. I ought to suggest to the gentleman that the chairman of the committee represents a district in which it was not proposed to extend the service, and that quite a number of members of the committee are gentlemen who have no cities in which it was proposed to extend it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I quoted from the hearing before the Post-Office Committee.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What cities now enjoy the pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Philadelphia, New York, and Boston.

Mr. BINGHAM. And Brooklyn.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I included Brooklyn in New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I shall not be accused of any feeling of locality when I point to the record before the Post-Office Committee, and the statement there of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General that if this appropriation should be granted, that its first use would be in the city of Boston. It is well conducted; it is honestly conducted there; it has a more valuable function in the city of Boston by reason of the relation of the post-office to the two great terminal stations which make it of greater use there than in any other city in the country.

My friends desire me to support the appropriation, and the public officials and some of the business community of Boston have written me asking me to support it. I can not do it. I believe it is fraught with evil, and I believe it will unduly swell the public expenditures. I would be glad to remain silent upon this proposition, and I wish I could; but, knowing these things, I could not remain silent and hold my seat upon this floor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does your argument go to the extent of abolishing the service in the places where it is now in operation?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. My argument would go to the extent of keeping the contracts which we have with the companies, which run a year or two longer, and then stop it.

A MEMBER. Why should we do that?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Well, we have made the contract. If it is the judgment of the House that we should cut off this service altogether, I acquiesce. I simply stated what I would be willing to do and what I think we ought to do.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman understands, of course, that the contract depends upon the appropriation; and there will be no bad faith in discontinuing the service if we want to do so.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The contract, as I understand, is made conditional upon the annual appropriation; and if Congress should see fit to discontinue all these contracts, it can do so.

A few words more, and I have done. The experience of foreign countries has been quoted in favor of the pneumatic tube. There is no experience in those countries which warrants the course of conduct upon which we are entering. In Berlin, in Paris, and in London there are pneumatic tubes; but they are owned by the post-office department itself; and a special stamp—from five to six and a half cents—is required upon every piece of mail which goes through those tubes. That is an entirely different proposition from the one we have here.

The gentleman from California said the other day that he hoped we should not undertake to go into the business of owning and operating pneumatic tubes. Well, sir, our experience with the Post-Office Department is not such as would lead us to believe that the Government can manage any great undertaking very successfully from a financial point of view. Yet there is a difference between extending this pneumatic-tube service under Government ownership and entering upon an entirely new service. If there be places here and there where the pneumatic tube is useful in the public service, let us build it ourselves and operate it ourselves. It is not a new undertaking; it is part of the present equipment of the Post-Office Department.

Mr. CORLISS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have but a few minutes remaining, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. CORLISS. As I understand the argument of the gentleman, he is criticising the methods of introducing and operating these tubes rather than the use of the tube itself.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I want to say now a few words about the use of the tube. My remarks, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] has just indicated, have heretofore been directed to another view of this question.

Mr. CORLISS. I should like to hear what the gentleman thinks of the practicability and value of the pneumatic tube if operated honestly for the best service of the post-offices in the cities.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Chairman, what is the proposition before us? I am afraid to enter upon it. We



shall have all this service controlled by one company before we get very much further into it. I have in my hand an advertisement of the American Pneumatic-Tube Service Company, which, as appears by this advertisement, has an authorized capital of \$15,000,000. The prospectus states, among other things, that the company owns and controls the patent for constructing pneumatic tubes; that it controls the pneumatic-tube system in Boston, carrying mail from the general office to the Northern Union Station, and is constructing another system in that city. It has under negotiation, as the prospectus states, "franchises for the leading cities of the country, so as to own and manage the pneumatic-tube service for streets and inside buildings."

Gentlemen, do not come here and talk any humbug about "trusts" if you are prepared to set one of that kind upon its feet by your action here to-day. There is an incipient trust. This company does not control the entire pneumatic-tube service now, because there is another great company in Philadelphia, the Batchelder Company, which controls the other part. But suppose they get these contracts all over the country, how long will it be before there will be a single company that will get every bit of its sustenance from appropriations made by the representatives of the people?

It is the Bell Telephone theory over again, a great manufacturing company that does not operate a telephone; but there is a telephone system in every city and town throughout the country, these telephones being controlled in each instance by a local company which operates the telephone system. The Bell Company is interested in all of them and controls all of them. It is a monopoly, as it has to be under the circumstances, for that particular kind of service.

Here is what is being done: There is a local company in Chicago; there is a local company in St. Louis, I doubt not; there is a local company in Boston and in Philadelphia and in New York. These local companies are being gotten up all over the country; and they are coming and asking you to extend these appropriations for the use of those particular cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman wish more time?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not want to take up any other gentleman's time.

Mr. MOON. You will not.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Very well.

Mr. MOON. I yield the gentleman ten minutes more.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. What does this proposition mean? Why, sir, a postmaster in the district of a colleague of mine—I have no objection to mentioning his name, my colleague Mr. GILBERT—saw in a newspaper the announcement to which I have referred. Seeing this announcement he wrote to my colleague, saying: "Why can we not have one of these pneumatic tubes for Springfield?" That is how it will be when this thing is fairly started. From each city will come the application, "Why can we not have the tube in our city?" And by and by somebody will get up, as was the case yesterday in reference to the rural free delivery, and propose to divide this up by Congressional districts.

Do you get economical expenditure of the public money under circumstances of that kind? I say no. If we are to use this pneumatic tube, the Government should own and construct the parts of that service which are desirable. If we start these local companies all over the country and have them managed by the main-spring of a great central company owning and controlling or interested in all the local companies, we shall have a bill on this subject which, in all its bad characteristics, will resemble the river and harbor bill. We shall have a bill that we can not dare to discuss in the House, and which we shall have to pass in the House under a motion to suspend the rules and without opportunity for amendment.

Mr. THROPP. Do I understand the gentleman to assume the position that the Post-Office Department, notwithstanding that contracts with the companies owning the patents have already been made to a certain extent, can go on and use this system?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will state in response to the gentleman that the testimony of Mr. Dilloway, a lawyer of eminence, before the Postal Commission, is to the effect that the patents were old; that most of them had expired, and he thought it possible, without infringement, that the Government could construct its own lines.

Mr. THROPP. And in that way the Government could own its own tubes without paying the royalties which are proposed to be charged, and may charge an extra postage to facilitate the passage of letters through the tubes?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Of course that could be done, if I understand the testimony. That is the way to use the tubes, if we are to use them at all. Let us use them with the payment of extra postage upon letters or mail matter transmitted through the tubes, so that the people of the country generally who do not

obtain the benefit of the tubes will not be burdened for their maintenance.

Mr. THROPP. I entirely agree with the gentleman in that regard.

Mr. BURLEIGH. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts going to introduce such an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, no. I shall not do so. There is no opportunity to prepare such an amendment, and I do not think it would be of any avail in reference to the pending bill.

I believe the gentleman from Illinois desired to ask a question. Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts this question. He spoke of fostering a trust in this pneumatic-tube business, it being under the control of the trust. As I understand it, this appropriation would not authorize the Post-Office Department to bind the Congress as to future appropriations in connection with this pneumatic mail service. I ask him, then, if that is not his construction of the provision embodied in the bill?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I suppose the Post-Office Department, in making additional contracts—for Boston, for instance—for this service, would be also required to extend it to Chicago, to Detroit, St. Louis, doubtless, and that there would be a pressure brought to bear from all of these cities and from other centers of business, demanding the inception or extension of the pneumatic-tube service. This pressure would come from all of the business centers of the country, and they would all be crying for more, more, more; and I tell you, gentlemen, that the time to stop is right now, in the very inception of the business.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think the pressure would amount to anything unless the service was shown to be a success and of value to the people?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do most emphatically. We examined this question in 1898. The postmaster at Brooklyn, Mr. Wilson, formerly a member of this House, a man of ability and character, said that, in his judgment, the pneumatic tube was of no practical use or value in that city. The postmaster at New York said that, in his judgment, it was a piece of extravagance; and the postmaster in Chicago, Mr. Gordon, said that he did not want it in that city. Generally, as far as we have been able to investigate the matter, we have reason to think that the service is of some value.

The demand for extension comes mainly from the people who are interested in organizing these companies and making a profit out of it. Now, that is all right. I have no objection to their doing so. That is a legitimate mode of transacting business. But we must distinguish between real and counterfeit.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me for a moment—

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that reports have come to the Department from the cities to which the gentleman has referred, or some of them, urging the establishment of the pneumatic-tube service in one way or another?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes; there seems to have been a change of opinion since the conversations to which I have referred. The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that when the establishment of these local companies becomes a fact, they are enabled to bring influences to bear through business men who are willing to say that it is a good thing. The St. Louis business man says that it has been established in Boston, why should we not have it. Chicago says why should we not have what New York has; Baltimore thinks it ought to fare as well as Brooklyn, and so pressure is brought to bear upon the Department.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if we had a provision of law for the establishment of smallpox hospitals throughout the United States, to be located in different parts of the country, every district in the United States would want one of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. CORLISS. If the gentleman will permit me, as I understand it, Boston has now the pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. In a very small way; only about three-quarters of a mile.

Mr. CORLISS. Does the gentleman wish to eliminate that from the appropriation here?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes; I am, as far as I am concerned, entirely willing to eliminate all the pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. CORLISS. Is the service in Boston satisfactory, and is the service rendered by the company there to the Department of any value to the mail service?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will state to the gentleman that I do not live in Boston, and represent no part of it. My district is some little distance away. But I have already stated what the recommendation of the postmaster in Boston was in regard to this matter. The postmaster recommends it, and the service, so far as I know, shows good results. Now, our friends say, does this do any good? Well, yes; it does. If you had a letter down town in New York that you want delivered up at Central Park,

if there was a pneumatic tube it would go up there a great deal quicker.

There would be some expedition of the mails as they arrive and depart at the great stations on their way farther along in the country—some, not a great deal. There would be some expedition of some small part of the whole mail, and a very considerable expedition of the local mail; but the expense would be entirely out of proportion to the benefits which would be obtained.

In New York, according to the testimony that was given to us, it cost \$170,000 a mile, or a little over that, to lay their 5.85 miles of service, and, in addition to that, it cost over \$150,000 a mile for what they paid for their patents to the Batchelder Pneumatic Tube Company, of Philadelphia.

There is benefit, it is true. You do not want to burn a house in order to boil an egg. You do not want to plunge your arm elbow deep into the public Treasury to get some good results to the public service. We have got to stop somewhere in this expedition of mails. Congress and the Department have considered expedition and never have considered economy.

I am not in favor of being mean with the public service, but I am in favor of that sound, economical business judgment which every man would exercise in his own affairs.

The whole pneumatic-tube question is before the Postal Commission. I agree that that commission ought to have reported before, but there are difficulties in the way, and the burden has been a heavy one, with all the other duties that we have all had to carry. If you do nothing more, I pray you, leave the question where it is until that commission report. Do not go ahead in the dark, in the face of the facts which I have stated to you, and which can not be obliterated.

Mr. FLEMING. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FLEMING. I will yield time to the gentleman to answer. I wish to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if it is not a fact, as far as he knows and believes, that the Postal Commission are more nearly unanimous in condemning the extension of this pneumatic-tube system than upon any other proposition before them?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is entirely right. I believe that with a single exception they are all against it, and that exception is simply that of a doubter.

Mr. THROPP. Can we not strike out this entire appropriation, and does not that relieve the Government of the contract?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It does, as I understand. The contracts are made subject to appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, one other consideration, and I am done. If, whenever a question of appropriating the public moneys comes before Congress, we are to be chloroformed by the deadly influence of the fact that some part of that public money is to go to our own district or our own State or our own section, then there is no more health for the public Treasury, and the time will come when the people will rise up and say that we have been unfaithful in the administration of our great trust.

The control of the public money belongs to the representatives of the people, belongs to this House. It can not be effectively exercised anywhere else except in this House. I beseech you, before you take another step, to examine carefully and act with the same prudence that you would use if you were transacting your own business. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have not the time. My time has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I wish to ask you whether you favor the discontinuance of the service as it now exists in New York?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LOUD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] seems willing to eliminate this pneumatic-tube service from the city of Boston; but, as a Representative in part of that city, I wish to enter an emphatic protest against any elimination of pneumatic service in the city of Boston.

The facts with regard to that service in our city are that it has been so successful as not only to have the indorsement of the postmaster, but it has earned the indorsement of the leading merchants of that city, and they desire not only a continuation of the service we already have, but extensions of it; and the men most earnest in desiring these extensions are the great retail dealers, who transact an enormous business each year by mail, who sell hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of goods upon mail orders.

These mail orders do not come alone from the city of Boston, but

from all the surrounding cities and towns—from my colleague's own district. Many and many of these orders are sent in from all over New England, and the people are enabled at the slight expense of a postal card or a postage stamp to order goods from merchants in Boston, who have a large assortment from which they can select. Now, anything that will expedite the receipt and sending out of these letters is a benefit not only to the business men of Boston, but to the housewives of all the surrounding towns, and to all who wish to transact business with the business men of a great city.

Something has been said, Mr. Chairman, about the service in Boston, and I shall take a part of my time in reading an extract from the Boston Transcript of April 23 of this year right on the subject. It is headed:

Mail-wagon service decreased—Boston post-office to demonstrate that the pneumatic tube can carry the paper and package mail.

I wish the committee to bear that in mind, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas that the tube service does not carry the paper mail.

All the mail-wagon trips between the post-office—

Mr. FLEMING. May I ask the gentleman a question at this point?

Mr. ROBERTS. Certainly.

Mr. FLEMING. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this 8-inch tube carries the paper mail?

Mr. ROBERTS. If the gentleman will wait until I have finished reading this article, he will find in it an answer to his question.

Mr. FLEMING. I would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. ROBERTS (reading)—

All the mail-wagon trips between the post-office and the North Station from 9 o'clock in the morning until about 11.15 o'clock have just been discontinued, and the entire mail passing between those points during that time is sent through the pneumatic tube. This is to demonstrate that the paper and package mail as well as the letter mail can go through the pneumatic tube and the wagon service can be reduced. It has worked to perfect satisfaction for three full days, which is almost sufficient guaranty for its continuance in this city. Between the hours mentioned the mail wagons used to make seven trips from the post-office to the railroad station, and eight trips in the opposite direction, handling the bulky mail for 61 trains arriving at and going out from the station. It requires about 75 additional dispatches through the pneumatic tube to handle this mail, and the machinery is in motion incessantly, although many more carriers could be shot through. An inspection of the character of the mail which now comes through the tubes was made recently, and it was found that one of the largest bundles contained 49 ten or twelve page newspapers. On the sorting tables there were only three packages too large for the tube, one of them being a calendar and another was a large photograph. These hours have been chosen for the experiment because it is the only time in the day that the wagon service can be dispensed with entirely. A little later the heavy paper mail begins to arrive, and the wagons have to make frequent trips.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the moment or two left me I desire to address myself briefly to the remarks of my colleague. He informs this committee that the Postal Commission have discovered—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LOUD. I will yield the gentleman two minutes more. That is all I can give.

Mr. ROBERTS. The Postal Commission has discovered a condition of rottenness in the letting or procuring of contracts for this pneumatic service. However that may be, I am not here to justify or condone anything that is crooked or dishonest in the matter. Yet, admitting that it is true, it is no argument against the benefits of the service itself; and that service has demonstrated, at least in the city of Boston, that it is desirable to be continued and extended.

Mr. LOUD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise principally to explain the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] in regard to a question that was asked of the representative of the Pneumatic Tube Company in the hearing before the Post-Office Committee. The representative of the company appeared before the committee with a proposition which he intended to submit to the Post-Office Department for the introduction of the pneumatic-tube service at a certain amount of money in 27 of the largest cities of the country. These 27 cities he named. They are: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, New Orleans, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Washington, Denver, Indianapolis, Jersey City, Kansas City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Newark, Omaha, Providence, Rochester, St. Paul, Baltimore, and Atlanta.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. What occurred then is my justification.

Mr. BROMWELL. The gentleman is entirely right. I merely wish to explain that I followed his statement of the 27 cities with a sort of jocular remark, and the gentleman is entirely correct in the statement of it:

I suggest that you reach all but Mr. SPERRY's, who is from New Haven.

Now, as a matter of fact, I want to say that the 27 cities did not reach all of the gentlemen who compose the Post-Office Committee. There are quite a number of them who have none of these



27 cities in their districts; and the remark was merely a facetious one, which ought not to have appeared as a part of the hearing. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entirely justified in saying what he did in regard to the matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having made a few remarks upon this subject yesterday, I wish to state my views briefly upon this pneumatic-tube service. I believe it does expedite the mails, but as to the extent is a question of doubt. In the hearings before the committee it was doubtful whether it expedited them a few minutes, half an hour, or an hour, or what length of time. I believe that it is a good thing for the expedition of the mails if the expense that attends it is not out of all proportion to what is gained in the saving of time. Personally, I am willing to have this expenditure carried on this year's bill. Personally, I am willing to have this experiment continued for the next year, where this pneumatic tube is located. And I should not object, perhaps, to extending it to one or two cities, but I am opposed, under the head of an experiment for increasing the rapidity of delivering the mails, of extending this indefinitely in all the large cities of the country until we know where we stand.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] is entirely correct in saying that in going into this blindly, without any knowing what the expenditure is ultimately to be, we are planning the way to a deficit and an expenditure of enormous amounts of money for which we should not get anything like a fair return. I shall vote for the appropriation in this bill because it is limited in amount; but what I fear is that in the future it will be with the pneumatic tube as it is with the rural free delivery—you get it into a few cities, and the representatives of every other large city will be clamoring for an appropriation to introduce the tube in his city. Therefore I want this appropriation, so long as it is carried in this bill, to grow gradually with the experience of the Department, and if the time comes that it has been demonstrated that we are expending more money for the service than we are getting out of it, then I want it cut out of this bill altogether.

Mr. LOUD. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I shall occupy the ten minutes, but I desire to submit to the committee, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and in view of my inquiry made to him, as well as my request that he give to the House all the testimony in connection with the pneumatic-tube service that forms a part of the report of the commission of which he is a member, they having gone into this question fully. Why he is not willing to do it I do not know. If unanimous consent was given by the House, there could be no demur on his part that the privileges of the RECORD were in any way being abused.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should not object to unanimous consent if the House wants to print the testimony in the RECORD. If the clerk of the commission, who is clerk of your committee, will pick it out and put it in the RECORD, I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank the gentleman. As to the question of an Assistant Postmaster-General going into the employ of a corporate interest after he leaves his public employment I have nothing to do with, and this House has nothing to do with it. It is a question of morals with himself. The gentleman from Massachusetts has stated it and made it public, and it is for the gentleman himself to defend, and neither for me or this House to take issue with. Whether it was by virtue of the knowledge of the value of the patent to the postal service, or whether it was by virtue of a desire to become associated with a corporation which he believed would be largely in the future beneficial to him, is wholly for the ex-Assistant Postmaster-General to determine. This question, to my mind, rests wholly upon the issue as to whether this service shall bring a fair return, in view of the expenditure, to the Government for the benefits given to the people.

The contracts existing to-day and expiring in 1901 cover the four services of the city of Philadelphia, the city of Boston, and the city of New York, with Brooklyn included. They cover an annual expenditure of \$225,000 by appropriation, and by contract of about \$223,000. The Postmaster-General has recommended an extension of the service, an increase of \$500,000. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Shallenberger, came before our committee and in detail submitted why this service should be extended to the extent of \$700,000 in the sum total.

The committee in its bill has made that recommendation. To what cities the Second Assistant Postmaster-General would decide to locate the service he did not make the committee his confidant, but simply stated that the selection would be made in the best interests of the service. The committee believed that statement and made the appropriation as a part of their bill. The whole question to be considered is the question of the usefulness in the sense of expedition. Expedition in the mails is the basis and the secret of increased revenues. You find it running through all the economic questions of to-day, more especially in the matter

of railroad transportation, appertaining not only to your mail, but in the carriage of freight and in the carriage of passengers.

To us in the postal service, identified with it in a great city like mine, with almost a million and a half of people—and the city of New York and the great centers—is affected by one specific result, not so much the quick delivery of the letter that comes from Chicago to Philadelphia or from San Francisco to Philadelphia, although it is a well-recognized necessity that that delivery be as speedy as possible, but it is the building up of intercommunication in the city between the people of one section and that of another. If we can deliver a letter from one particular section to another, and have it answered in the same day, it is the largest contribution that can be made to the postal service and the revenue, for the reason that the delivery of a letter from one section of a city to the other is the cheapest and most economical, so far as expense is concerned, in the delivery of mail matter.

In other words, if you give the great cities the opportunity by expedition, whether by mechanical devices or by the increase of subordinate force, as all communications go through the mails at the same rates of postage that it costs to transmit a letter from Maine to the State of Washington, you can readily see how local or city letter matter can be handled at minimum cost, for there is no railroad transportation to pay.

Mr. SIBLEY. I believe your postmaster at Philadelphia stated that the increased service, doing a way with special messengers, would, in his judgment, meet the entire cost of the service in that city.

Mr. BINGHAM. He so stated it, without a doubt. And it will do the same in all the great cities.

Mr. SIBLEY. And the same testimony was substantially given from Boston and New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Now, without making any invidious distinctions, with full recognition that it is the purpose of this House in the future (I trust under carefully guarded statute) to develop the rural free delivery—to what extent it may go no man in this House can now predict; that it should go wherever the people require it I heartily concede—I say that gentlemen from those rural sections must not forget that the revenues of the Government, so far as your postal administration is concerned, are today more largely contributed by the great cities in the expeditious work of the local free delivery than from any other source of revenue under the administration of the Department.

The money of the service is made in your great cities; and it is made from the expedition of the local free delivery. And, gentlemen, as you hope for the development of the rural free delivery in the future, I say to you, you must not impoverish your central reservoir, that gives you the money for this development, by depriving the cities of any physical or mechanical device that will contribute to expedition. You have the postal cars on your street railways in this city and other cities. Why? Because it is the quickest way of handling your mails from station to office or vice versa. So you have your carriers riding on bicycles, at a cost of thousands of dollars. Why? Because in that way the work is done more quickly, and therefore a mechanical device or aid is justified. And so this whole question must run wherever expedition can be secured.

The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Cincinnati in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, to the effect that the question was before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads as to whether we would accept the proposition of the parent company in connection with the pneumatic-tube service, was somewhat qualified. Let me go more largely into that question. The proposition was to handle the mails in 27 cities—not because those cities were identified with the gentlemen on the committee; I suppose there was identification in five, six, or seven cases—but because in certain great cities of the Union they offer to do this work at an expense of, in round numbers, two and a half million dollars, excluding \$900,000 paid for wagon service.

Mr. SIBLEY. No, including the wagon service.

Mr. BINGHAM. Including the wagon service. That would be a little over \$1,600,000 for pneumatic-tube service in these 27 great cities of the country. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General submitted that all he desired to do was handling the proposition of \$700,000 as a sum total. We conceded that, and we excluded the larger proposition, although so good a business man as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] said that if the Government could secure a contract like that, the benefits to the people would be without limit and the compensation paid by the Government less almost than the word "reasonable" signifies.

Mr. RIDGELY. Does the gentleman favor extra postage for the use of these tubes?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am not in favor of extra postage; for the whole issue and trend to-day is toward uniform or lower rates of postage.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RIDGELY. I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no objection to answering it, if I be allowed the time.

Mr. RIDGELY. One minute will be sufficient.

Mr. LOUD. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] one minute, that he may answer the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY].

Mr. RIDGELY. My question is this: In view of the fact that the gentleman objects to extra postage for the use of these tubes, and in view of the fact that a plea has been made for the cities because business centers there, does not the gentleman know that the cities and their business depend upon the people in the rural districts, and those people in the rural districts are taxed as heavily to keep up the expense of the mail service as are the people in the cities?

Mr. BINGHAM. The first part of the gentleman's proposition I will not enter into, because I think it wholly unnecessary; but my main argument is that the real profit in the great cities, coming from the interchange of letters in said cities, gives you the largest revenue for the minimum of expense; in other words, the intercommunication of a million or two millions of people renders a big return when it is located within the limits of a city, and not extended over a large range of country, as, for instance, between Maine and California, where railroad fare and transportation are a part of the expense.

Mr. RIDGELY. But that is only possible by reason of the rural population.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LOUD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, this subject has been so ably argued by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] and the gentleman from Boston [Mr. ROBERTS] that there is little left for me to say.

There is not a daily newspaper in the city of New York that has not its own pneumatic-tube service. It is an indispensable requisite for the newspaper business. The pneumatic tube, Mr. Chairman, like the elevator, is here, and it has come to stay. This House, for two Congresses, refused to appropriate money even to run an elevator. They laughed it to scorn; but things are changing; the world is progressing. The elevator is in universal use.

Now, sir, I have received from several associations in New York and from many business men—and shall doubtless receive many more such—letters and dispatches urging me to advocate this pneumatic-tube service. I know its value. The people of New York know its value. They have tried it, as I have said, in the newspaper offices in that great city, and no establishment which operates on any considerable scale can be considered as complete without this adjunct. Now, if it is good for the newspapers of the city, it is equally good for the business interests of the people. It increases the facilities of the postal service and increases business, and in time will become a source of revenue.

Mr. Chairman, the city of New York pays a net profit to this Government of \$5,000,000 every year on the postal service. A portion of this money goes to South Carolina for free rural delivery; a very little goes to Georgia; more of it perhaps goes to the State of Ohio; but it is distributed throughout the whole Union for your rural free delivery and for other necessities connected with your postal system. You have your free delivery simply because of the money which the Government makes out of the large post-office receipts coming from the great cities of the country—post-offices like those of the city of New York.

Now, are you going to turn around and tell us that we are not to be allowed a modicum of these five millions for our own use? Are you going to say to us that we can not use any portion of the money to expedite and improve our service there? Are you going to refuse to allow us to expend \$750,000 of the \$5,000,000 that we pay annually for your benefit for the betterment of our service in that and other large cities? If you do, then, to use language that has been used on this floor, we are the "skinned" and you are the "skinneers." [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, something has been said in regard to the postmaster at New York and his position on this pneumatic-tube service. Let me read what he does say:

In reply to your letter of the 3d of August, regarding electric and cable car service, I have to report that no service of the former character is in operation in this city. With regard to the latter, the cable-car service, I have to state that the only service of that nature which is in operation here is that performed on the cars of the Third Avenue Railroad route, No. 37013, and that no extension has been made therein during the past year; in fact, this service has been curtailed during that period to the extent that the separation of mail thereon has been discontinued (with the exception of that posted in the cars), and the service now performed consists of an exchange of closed pouches made up at the general post-office and at the various branch stations. This curtailment has been effected through the introduction of the pneumatic tubes, a large portion of the letter mail formerly dispatched via the cable cars now being sent via the tube.

When the tube system between the general post-office and Branch Station

is in full operation so as to embrace all of the intermediate stations, which I am informed by the Tubular Dispatch Company will be very shortly, service on the Third Avenue cable cars can be discontinued below Forty-second street, as there will be practically nothing to be done on the cars, the letter mail being sent by tube and the bulky paper matter by wagon. Before this could be done, however, arrangements would have to be made for a switch at Forty-second street, there being none there at present. If it is deemed advisable to do this at any time, and it is found to be practicable to do so, it would effect a reduction in mileage of 418 trips per week of 3 miles each and a reduction in wagon-service route No. 407005 of 1,672 trips per week of 0.03 mile each and 838 trips per week of 0.27 mile each.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield at this point for a question?

Mr. CUMMINGS. No, I can not. The gentleman should not ask me to yield when I have only five minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. The gentleman need not lose his temper.

Mr. CUMMINGS. You know that I have only about five minutes, and I can not allow you to take up the little time that remains.

Mr. FLEMING. I am very sorry to have aroused the gentleman's indignation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Of course the gentleman knows that I mean no discourtesy to him; but when I have but a very few moments left it must be apparent that I can not, in justice to myself, yield any of that time.

Mr. FLEMING. I did not know what time the gentleman had. He might have had a half hour as far as I knew.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Oh, well, I accept the gentleman's apology.

[Laughter.]

Mr. FLEMING. I have offered no apology. None was necessary, as far as I was concerned, and none has been tendered. I simply asked a polite question.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am sorry I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CUMMINGS. With the permission of the House, I will extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word as to the figures given in the minority report. With reference to this service in New York let me read:

The line is of double pneumatic tubes, and is over 58,000 feet long, not taking into calculation bends, switches, and special work. The pipe used by this company is not common pipe, but specially made pipe, and of a special grade of iron which can not be bought for less than 75 cents a foot; besides this, every foot of it has to be bored like an engine cylinder, which makes the cost of it over three times the figures mentioned.

The ditch is not an ordinary ditch, but specially planned, and the pipe buried as near as possible in a straight line, and is in some instances 16 feet below the pavement. In the laying of the pipe, water, gas, and other pipes have to be removed to enable it to be laid straight. It has to be laid on special foundations, and must be carefully tamped to prevent its settling or in other ways getting out of line. Drip pots for catching moisture, sewer connections, etc., to relieve the pipe of condensation, etc., have to be put in every few hundred feet. Manholes have to be constructed, at enormous expense, for the purpose of reaching the switches, drip pots, and bends. Every curve is a brass bend, and none of them costs less than \$300 apiece.

In some districts the excavations cost not less than \$8 a foot. This cost must be increased where solid rock is encountered or where the pipe is laid below tide water. The replacing of the pavement at the regular New York City rates costs over \$1.50 a running foot, not calculating special work around manholes, etc. The machinery in one station (the general post-office) cost more than \$34,000, the amount named by the committee as their minimum estimate of construction.

The statement in the minority report that only a single pipe is laid shows that the committee knows absolutely nothing about it. There are invariably two pipes laid, one in either direction. The pipe itself can not be connected in the ditch, with the special air-tight joint, for less than 50 cents a foot after it is put in place (which for two pipes will be \$1 per running foot of the trench). This does not include the connecting up of drip pots, manholes, switches, and other special apparatus.

The company has spent in the last year over \$34,000 in improvements on this line. The system requires the use of three power stations, one entire building being devoted to boilers, engines, and machinery. Power from two independent power stations of the company, exclusive of the post-office station, costs the company over \$30,000 a year. The Government tried to run these lines at the beginning and it resulted in a dismal failure. The disbursement paid by the Government for the operation of this line was not less than at the rate of \$30,000 per annum, and the amount of \$10,000 mentioned by the committee as being allowed for operating expenses was only a compromise, so that the company could properly operate the line. On this item alone a company has relieved the Government to the extent of \$20,000 per annum on their contract. Besides this, the company has installed the new power station, which reduces the amount of steam that the Government has to furnish under their contract, at an increased cost to the company of between \$12,000 and \$15,000.

The cost of operating this line, including double shifts of engineers and operators, can not be done for less than 60 per cent of its rental, which is then cheaper than electric roads are operated. The company pays over \$12,000 per annum for taxes and percentages to the city for the franchise of the tubes. The company is not and never has been in position to pay anything upon its capital stock. Outside of the cost of construction of the line, it went to enormous expense in not only acquiring the patents but in obtaining its franchises, for which it is now receiving nothing. The total carrier mileage of the line to-day is 16,890 miles.

This information, Mr. Chairman, comes from official sources and is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to animadvert upon the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody], because I see that he is not in his seat at the present time. I simply desire to say that an argument made wholly by innuendo neither conveys to me any information



nor does it excite or prejudice me against an affirmative proposition.

This proposed appropriation comes to us from the committee having the matter in charge, guided by that most honest, painstaking, and patriotic of gentlemen [Mr. LOUD], its chairman. I believe that it might be possible once in a while to consider a bill in this House without encountering the opposition of the members of the Committee on Appropriations. I notice that everything which they formulate seems to them at least to be all right, and a great many things which other committees formulate seem to them to be all wrong.

Now, Mr. Chairman, up to a year ago, I was strongly prejudiced against this pneumatic-tube system. About a year ago I was led to make a careful examination of its features and also of the practicability of introducing it into the city of St. Louis, which I have the honor in part to represent, and after reading all the testimony available, and examining the system, I became convinced that it was one of the things we needed in St. Louis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been an earnest friend and advocate of, and I have stood first and last by the free rural-delivery system. I believe it is a good thing, and that every measure which Congress can adopt which will bring the people into closer relations with each other, and that will facilitate the means of communication between them is a good thing, whether the Government makes any profit on it or not.

I observe in examining the statistics of the Post-Office Department that 16 cities of the United States, after paying all the expenses of their local postal systems, produce a net revenue to the Government of nearly \$18,000,000 a year, and the city of St. Louis, where I live, produces and pays over to the Government a net profit of \$1,200,000 every year. I think that inasmuch as this great accumulation of profit of nearly \$18,000,000 from these 16 cities goes to develop and to carry on your rural-free-delivery system, we are entitled to all the devices that the Government can bring into action, which will be fairly calculated to give us every facility which money can buy or genius can invent. [Applause.]

I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to drawing this line of demarcation between country and city. What helps one class of people helps another in this country, and what injures one class of people injures another class. All these contracts are under the control of Congress, subject to appropriation, and if the frauds insinuated by the gentleman from Massachusetts exist in connection with this business it is within the power of Congress at any time not only to investigate them, but to put the heel of condemnation upon them by withdrawing the entire appropriation.

This system, Mr. Chairman, is beyond the field of experimentation. Its benefits have been proven by actual practice in four of the cities of this country and in a number of the great cities of Europe, and the system is entirely practicable. It has come to stay, and whether it costs \$500,000 or \$5,000,000, if it will facilitate the mails and bring the people of the country closer together then they have been before, I am in favor of the appropriation, whatever it shall amount to, if reasonable. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, about the benefits of the system.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, by consent of the House I add to my remarks a tabulated statement of the receipts and expenditures and profits realized from 16 cities of the country.

City.	Gross receipts.	Expenses.	Revenue.	Per cent of expense to gross receipts.
Brooklyn, N. Y.	\$1,325,047.83	\$910,718.44	\$414,329.39	* 60
New York, N. Y.	8,811,547.83	3,428,022.29	5,383,525.54	39
Baltimore, Md.	1,083,115.23	575,781.09	487,334.14	54
Philadelphia, Pa.	3,143,929.91	1,545,840.98	1,598,088.93	49
New Orleans, La.	437,743.41	205,243.83	232,499.58	47
Boston, Mass.	2,970,383.38	1,390,441.74	1,600,941.64	46
San Francisco, Cal.	998,929.74	450,408.82	548,520.92	45
Buffalo, N. Y.	775,323.22	396,377.48	438,945.74	43
St. Paul, Minn.	482,761.58	204,745.19	278,016.39	42
Indianapolis, Ind.	431,115.47	175,254.61	255,860.86	41
Minneapolis, Minn.	607,342.75	247,753.36	359,589.39	41
Chicago, Ill.	6,131,123.04	2,437,251.83	3,693,871.21	40
Cincinnati, Ohio	1,155,646.05	453,352.98	702,293.07	39
Pittsburg, Pa.	835,671.42	390,060.78	505,610.64	39
Denver, Colo.	382,753.37	148,508.93	234,244.44	39
St. Louis, Mo.	1,826,742.99	647,185.28	1,179,557.71	35

\* Average, 54.

Mr. LOUD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT].

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to argue the merits or demerits of the pneumatic-tube service. Its merits have been well established by its use in four cities of the country, and not only in our own country, but in all the civilized countries of the world where the pneumatic-tube system is now in practical operation. New York, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and Boston have

the benefits of that system. Can the opponents of the appropriation asked for in this bill assign a single reason why the system should not be extended to my city, when money has been appropriated for New York, Philadelphia, and other Eastern cities? If they have the benefits of that system, we want it in our city. We need it and we must have it.

In the near future we shall celebrate in the city of St. Louis a world's fair, and for the purpose of handling the vastly increased mail matter which will come to that city on account of the world's fair we must have increased postal facilities.

As my colleague from St. Louis [Mr. PEARCE] has truly said, the city of St. Louis is contributing \$1,200,000 a year of net profit for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the mail service in the rural districts of this country. In other words, the revenues of the Government from the city of St. Louis are \$1,200,000 in excess of its expenditures. This being the case, Mr. Chairman, we ask that whatever means science may afford for the facilitation of the mail we should have. We have a right to ask for it and should have it, no matter what the expense may be.

In order to show how important this pneumatic-tube service will be in my city, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask the Clerk to read a part of a statement made by the postmaster of St. Louis before the committee. He is one of the most efficient postal officials in this country.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pneumatic-tube service is not intended to make more deliveries in large cities. The pneumatic-tube service is not intended to advance only the local mail in cities. The mail principally advanced is the outgoing and incoming mail. The mails from Texas and other States are as important to our merchants as the merchants who mail the letters. The same applies to every part of the country. If you will allow me just to state the conditions and make a comparison between the present method and the proposed method, I think a few points will show you the advantage. First, the present method—hauling the mail by wagons—represents the handling of an accumulation of mail. The pneumatic service means the handling of mail by continuous service. The wagons are steady—the time is fixed for their leaving—but, if the language can be used, they go steady by jerks, but by the pneumatic-tube system it is one continuous flow.

Now, to begin, our Union Station is located just 1 mile from the post-office. The length of time required for the hauling of that mail is fifteen minutes, ten minutes allowed for terminal transportation from the wagon to the cars, making in all twenty-five minutes, but bear in mind it is not only a race with the twenty-five minutes to see if we can get the mail to this station or from the station quicker than twenty-five minutes, but that wagon service means an accumulation of mail for hours, from one to ten hours and longer sometimes, and consequently the wagon is loaded to the guards and it reaches then not only the twenty-five minutes, but the time saved by this continuous flow of mail either from or to the station. At St. Louis we have five deliveries through the business districts, three deliveries in the resident districts. We ask for no more and want no more. The mails, however, come in at a time when they are hard to handle, between the hours of 7.30 and 8.30 in the morning, and between the hours of 6.30 and 8 in the evening, 95 per cent of the mail received at St. Louis, 95 per cent of all the mail which comes in.

So far as the local mail is concerned, we simply seek to advance that through the handling from the office for outgoing trains so as to enable our merchants to close their mails later, and so on the incoming trains to get the mails delivered earlier. In all large cities the second morning delivery by carrier is the important delivery, especially to the banks and to the larger commercial houses, department stores, and manufacturers. It is necessary that all of these bankers, merchants, and large business interests deposit their checks in time for the clearing house. Right there is one important feature. All banks clear through the clearing house, and all checks must be in before 10 o'clock in the morning, or else one day's interest is lost. The amount of interest of those checks day by day at the end of the year would pay for the pneumatic tube itself. We ask for a pneumatic tube connecting our Union Station, the Relay Depot, East St. Louis, and certain important business districts.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Chairman, the postmaster at St. Louis calls attention to two facts in that statement which I should like the House to understand. One is that the pneumatic-tube service is not only for the city, but is for the country as well. The country merchant is benefited by the facilities afforded by this system just as much as the city merchant is. The second point is the time saved and the money saved to the merchant when he is enabled to deposit his checks a day sooner than he would otherwise be able to do.

Mr. LOUD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. NOONAN].

Mr. NOONAN. Mr. Chairman, as to the pneumatic-tube service, my own observation in the city of Chicago leads me to believe that it is now time that that city should receive the benefit of a share of this appropriation for that purpose. I think gentlemen do not rise to the occasion when they oppose such a provision. I have not any doubt that a thorough investigation of the benefits of extending this system to Chicago would furnish proof in favor of the consideration of the appropriation.

Chicago is the largest city in the country in actual domain in square miles. We have five great depot centers; railroad termini at different points, miles apart; three great divisions of the city, separated by the Chicago River, the stock-yards interests being far remote from the center of the city. The convergence by the pneumatic-tube service of the postal facilities of these different points would enhance the value of business by its expedition. The exploits of genius in mechanical devices, in labor-saving devices, is to bring the minds of men together and to facilitate the manufacture and transportation of material from

producer to consumer. This pneumatic-tube service aids in this. We should take advantage of the opportunity. Not only do we bring the minds of men together by communication, but it facilitates the transaction of business in a large city, where time is of greatest value.

The Western Union Telegraph Company in Chicago use the pneumatic-tube service to transmit messages between branch offices and the main office.

When a private corporation finds such a device and service successful and profitable, I think the Government should avail itself of some benefits for the transaction of postal business in Chicago.

I am in favor of the report of the committee for that appropriation.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, when the minority of the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads presented their report to this House, objecting to the continuation of the pneumatic-tube service, it was upon the idea that this House, having already appointed a commission to investigate the merits of this system and report upon the whole general postal system of the country, should be informed as to the facts, that commission having failed to report. We thought that this having been done, it was best that the House proceed no further in the extension of these alleged facilities to other cities until the report was made. It is not our purpose, then, to move to strike out of the bill all of this item, so as to deprive the cities of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia at present, where the service now exists, of the present service, but to call the attention of the House to the facts, in order that the House itself might determine, upon the threshold of the introduction of this new system of transporting the mails, whether it was wise to extend it or not.

In our judgment, the benefits to be derived are by no means commensurate with the cost of the system; yet we thought it was best, when the report was made, to await the results of the report of that commission before we abandoned that system entirely. Therefore at the end of this debate we shall move to strike out the words "seven hundred and twenty-five thousand" and restore the appropriation of \$225,000, as it was before, unless developments shall justify the motion to strike the item from the bill.

It is insisted by gentlemen who represent large cities elsewhere in the country that it is a matter of injustice to them not to extend this system to their cities. Assuredly, if benefits are to be derived, or can be derived, in the cities in which it is now used for the people generally, the system ought to be extended throughout the country; but it means, when we do this, to duplicate the cost of the whole Post-Office Department.

When we look to the facts of the operation of this system in one city we can determine, as the minority determined, that the service is not worth the cost. It is a pure, simple business proposition. It is not a question of contest between country districts and city districts. The question is whether it is best for the whole people for the Government of the United States to inaugurate this system throughout the country or not. Let us take the city of New York and see the operations of the system there. The first proposition is, Are the benefits derived to the people of the city of New York worth the money that is paid for them? Take the testimony produced before the committee, scan closely the evidence of every man upon that subject, and we find the testimony to be about this: Some believe that the mails of that city are expedited by the use of the tube from ten to twenty minutes, some from twenty to thirty minutes. The highest figure, however, put it, according to my recollection, at fifty minutes. Now, the tube in New York City is 30,000 feet long. The tube is used in the heart of that great city only. A small, limited area of New York, therefore, is covered by it.

The tube cost anywhere from \$34,000 to \$300,000, quite a range in estimate of cost, judging from the evidence. The Government pays to-day to the owners of that patent the sum of \$148,000 for the use of the tube, and the Government operates it itself and pays \$10,000 for operating expenses. Now, in a great city where you have eight free deliveries daily, where the people can get their mail once an hour during the business hours of the day, what is the value of a tube that only expedites the mail ten minutes? We have no use for that tube. It gives us no benefit that we ought to take and pay the cost that we have to pay for it. If by the use of the tube any other expense in the carrying of the mail was diminished, there might be some reason for its use. But we are told by Mr. Shallenberger, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, that the bicycle carriers are still in use; that the wagon carriage is still in use. The mail, the bulk of it, is still transported from one station to another by wagons. That wagon service has not been diminished one iota.

The Government to-day pays every dollar for the wagon service that it paid heretofore. The mail is expedited ten to twenty minutes by the pneumatic tube at an expense of \$158,000 to the people of the United States, and that, too, in an area where you get eight free deliveries daily.

Now, if you propose to extend the system to the other cities and

pay a like sum, you will run into hundreds and millions of dollars expenditure for the pneumatic-tube service. Our judgment is that it is a bad proposition of business, that at least for the present this House ought not to sanction any appropriation that looks to the continuation of this service. Let the House wait until the postal commission reports, when all the facts are before it, and then, if it seems wise and just, if it seems for the interest of this country that the system be continued, it is time enough to continue it. Therefore, I move, Mr. Chairman, that after the word "otherwise," on line 6, page 15, the word "seven" be stricken out and the word "two" inserted; so that the section will read: "for the transportation of mail by pneumatic tube and other similar service, by purchase or otherwise, \$225,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 6, after the word "otherwise," strike out "seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two;" so that it will read, "\$225,000."

Mr. MOON. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman should use all of his time now.

Mr. MOON. If the gentleman insists that we shall use all of our time, we will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has used all of his time. The remainder of the time belongs to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] regarding this appropriation. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], and I want to say that so far as his remarks apply to the service in New York it is correct and nothing new. The House was substantially informed of as much of this matter one year ago as I thought at that time could safely be presented to the House in view of the fact that the testimony of the committee had not been published. I have stated before that the service in New York was conceived in sin and born in iniquity, and to that extent I quite agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. But if that be a fact I can not anticipate why from year to year the House should continue this most iniquitous portion of this service.

Mr. MOON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LOUD. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is a member of the Postal Commission. It was out of deference alone to that commission that I made the suggestion that we wait until the commission reports. If the gentleman, as a member of that commission, is of the opinion that he now expresses, I desire to change my motion to amend, and move to strike out the whole section.

Mr. LOUD. I do not care what the gentleman's motion is; I was only discussing the motion he had presented. I have been over this subject so many times and my position here is so well known that I do not care to say much about it. But as chairman of the committee of course the House must understand that I can not take a position antagonistic to this item in the appropriation bill. I have stated to this House for three years that they should either continue this service or strangle it. For three years they have continued the service, and, as I said the other day, I thought I knew when I was hit over the head with a club as readily as any man.

If three years is not long enough for this Congress to establish what it proposes to do, I would like, in God's name, to know how long you have got to continue an experiment of this kind? The committee had expected that after these years had passed by it was the policy of Congress to continue the pneumatic-tube service. Why, sir, New York, and Philadelphia, and Boston, and Brooklyn can not have all the good things there are in this world, if this be a good thing. As I said before, I believe we started this thing wrong. I have said the same thing regarding the perpetuation of the rural free-delivery service. But, as gentlemen understand, after you embark upon a proposition, and it becomes the settled policy of Congress, the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads must then assume that you propose to continue it.

Now, when you come to analyze carefully this rural free-delivery service, you must see that under this service, so far as it is being established to-day, the average number of people served by a carrier is not in excess of 500. What does that mean? At least \$1 per head for the father and mother and every child in the family. And I think if rural free-delivery service means, as it must mean (if that be a correct representation of the case), sixty or seventy million dollars to expedite the mails through the rural districts of the country, then the few millions that may be expended for pneumatic-tube service are so insignificant as hardly to be worthy of consideration.

I do not know what this is going to develop. I know there was a statement made before the committee—and it is now on file with the Second Assistant Postmaster-General—giving in detail the estimates, in which the Batchelder Pneumatic Tube Company said



that they would put into those 27 cities the pneumatic-tube service, including the wagon service, at a total cost of \$2,522,000.

And that wagon service amounts to \$900,000. I said at the hearing that if this could be done I was in favor of it. I question whether it can be done; but I know there is on file in the office of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General to-day a segregated, detailed statement regarding each one of these 27 cities. I have some faith in the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and he has given me personally many assurances that he would not extend this service if it were to cost in any one city any more than the itemized amount presented to him by this company. And I never would have been brought even to the point of giving assent to this proposition until I had talked with both the Second Assistant and with the Postmaster-General. They believe this can be done; and I believe that if this project can not be carried out the Second Assistant Postmaster-General will not undertake to extend the pneumatic-tube service.

I have nothing further to say, Mr. Chairman, and am ready for a vote.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My object in making this motion is first to call attention to this appropriation—where it began and where it now is. It had its inception in the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. The Committee on Appropriations has never directly had anything to do with the recommendations touching it. It is true that after it was started in the cities where it exists it became necessary under the contracts which had been made in pursuance of the appropriation to operate it; and the sundry civil bill for 1898 and 1899 carried this item:

For supplying necessary power and repairs to power plants for operating pneumatic tubes for the transmission of mail matter, court-house and post-office buildings, Philadelphia, Pa., New York City, and Brooklyn, N. Y., and the post-office and subtreasury building, Boston, Mass., \$20,000.

In other words, in these public buildings, in connection with the steam plants, they had to furnish the power for pneumatic-tube service under the contracts that had been made. The contracts were sent for, the whole matter was fully investigated, and as there was a legal liability under the law and under the appropriation and under the contracts, the sundry civil bill carried, and still carries, the items that I have referred to.

Mr. BINGHAM. The buildings being under the control of the Treasury Department.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes. Now, that is all the Committee on Appropriations has ever had to do with this whole matter.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this discussion. I will not take time in replying to my friend the gentleman from Missouri, who thought he would strengthen his case by making the chestnutty old fling at the Committee on Appropriations, because, forsooth, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] was a member of it. He might as well have taken his fling at the Postal Commission, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts is also a member, such membership charging him with a duty to the House which he has been performing.

But that is all "leather and prunella." I care nothing about it. So far as I am concerned, I am going to vote against this appropriation [applause], for the reason that I think our great blocks of population, that I have great pride in and respect for, are already reasonably supplied with mail facilities—four or five deliveries, and in some places six deliveries, a day by post-office carriers.

A MEMBER. In some places nine.

Mr. CANNON. In some places nine. That is proper; I am not complaining of it. In addition to that there are the substations scattered all over the cities, and the money-order stations and all that kind of thing. And we see, Mr. Chairman, when we come to the post-office at New York City—a big city covering a large area of ground—the post-office in some instances a long way from certain business or residence parts of the city, but substations abound all over the city, just as is the case in other cities everywhere throughout the land.

Here is the carrier service with its eight or nine deliveries a day. If that service is not enough, we find these various substations and branch offices to help out the service and to accommodate the people; and when we consider all of these things I think that the United States does just as much as it ought to do to give a prompt, proper, and efficient service. There can be no question of that. If, however, that is not sufficient, there is the telephone service and the telegraph service, which is available to all people. If a private citizen wants greater speed, or is not satisfied with the postal service, he can resort to the telephone service or to the telegraph service—and many of them do so. If he finds fault with the postal service, these are available to him. If he is not willing to rely upon the eight or nine deliveries a day in his district, he has got, in addition to the telephone and telegraph service, the messenger-boy service, and many business men use the messengers.

Now, in my judgment, we have gone just as far as we ought to go in response to public demands for rapid mail delivery in the great post-office cities of the country. We have gone as far as we

ought to go in reference to the expenditures under the Post-Office Department in caring for speedy mails in the great centers of business and population—just as far as we ought to go in justice to the Treasury, and I may say, Mr. Chairman, in justice to that very population itself. All of our people are interested in this matter. These cities are a part and parcel of the general population of the United States.

All of our people, whether they live in the cities or in the rural communities, are interested in this service, and all want to see it improved, and the cities themselves would not prosper very long without the aid of the rural communities. What is good policy for us in the rural districts of Illinois is good policy for the teeming millions in New York or in Chicago. I do not separate them. They are all alike interested in this common cause. We are "all in the same boat" in that regard. When the taxes are collected and the expenditures are to be paid, we all should bear an equal share of them. I think, therefore, that this expenditure with reference to the postal service has gone far enough, and to be entirely fair I will vote to strike out all of this appropriation, and if that fails I will vote to wipe all out except the current appropriation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I can see no reason whatever, in justice or in sound principles of taxation, why the Post-Office Department of the United States ought not to be self-sustaining at the present time. There is not another country in the world that does not make its post-office department sustain itself. Some of them, indeed, give large revenues to the government.

I can not understand, therefore, why, under proper management in the United States, our own Postal Department ought not to bear its own share of governmental expenditure, and become, as it ought to be, entirely self-sustaining. The Government furnishes buildings without rent for the service; it furnishes hundreds of clerks in the Auditor's department of the Treasury, the expenses of which are charged to the Treasury Department of the Government, and yet year after year the Post-Office Department shows up a deficiency. Only a year or two ago it was \$12,000,000, and now they make an estimate of a deficiency reduced to the sum of some three or four millions of dollars. But, as I understand it, the committee was forced, by some pressure, to bring in an appropriation which would carry that deficiency up to seven or eight millions of dollars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to these extravagant appropriations not only in this, but in all of the other Departments of the Government. I do not mean to cast any reflection upon the efficiency of the postal service. It is unquestionably an efficient service. No one can deny that; but at the same time it is most costly, the least economically managed system in the public service and probably in the world. And if there is a crying need to-day in the management of our Government affairs, it is that some good, competent business man should be placed at the head of that Department to make it economical as well as self-sustaining and efficient.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. FLEMING. Gladly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. You say that the Post-Office Department is not economically administered. Now, do you think that there are too many clerks employed in that Department?

Mr. FLEMING. I will say, in response to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that I do not know exactly in what respect this money has been unwisely expended. I only know the general results which have come to the service. I do not now undertake to say in what specific manner extravagance has been shown in the management of the Department. I am speaking of the results which are manifest to us all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then do you concede that the clerks who are employed are too highly paid for their services?

Mr. FLEMING. I will not answer that question, for I do not know.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Somewhere, in either the one or the other of these items, must lie the extravagance of which the gentleman from Georgia complains. Now, will he state where that extravagance is to be found?

Mr. FLEMING. Yes; I will tell the gentleman some of the extravagant features of the administration of the Post-Office Department. We have a considerable amount expended, for instance, in this very service we are now considering, the pneumatic-tube service. A large amount is expended in the railroad rates—the pay for carrying the mails; and we have a large expenditure in the transmission of the mails of second-class mail matter that never was intended to go at the rate—so much of it is now allowed to go. I have now stated three particulars in which more economy should be practiced.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that last is owing to

the extravagance of the Post-Office Department or to the extravagance of the legislators who make the laws?

Mr. FLEMING. I will answer the gentleman. It was originally the extravagance of the Post-Office Department or the failure of the head of the Department to properly rule on the law as Congress passed it; and each succeeding Postmaster-General has followed that precedent until now it has become practically a law, and it seems that the members of this House are not willing to go back to the original status. The responsibility now rests on Congress.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit me right there?

Mr. FLEMING. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman says the initial error was in the construction put upon the law by the Postmaster-General. Now, does that refer to the fact that the Postmaster-General held as lawful the distribution through the mails as second-class matter of these serial books?

Mr. FLEMING. I understand the Postmaster-General did it on the advice of the law officer of the Government.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman know that that identical thing is what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] said was one of the prime objects of the law when it was first passed—the distribution of that matter—and instead of being a violation of the intention of the legislators when they passed it, it was exactly what they had in mind?

Mr. FLEMING. I do not know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] can be appealed to as authority on all questions, but I think he is certainly right on this one (pneumatic-tube service), and he is generally right on the appropriations, for he has certainly made an honest effort in this Congress to hold them down. I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, that the people are going to send somebody here to put a stop to this extravagance if we do not stop it ourselves.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON]. Does he desire to amend the motion?

Mr. MOON. Yes; I desire the motion to be to strike out lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 15, carrying the whole appropriation for the pneumatic-tube service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15 strike out lines 5, 6, and 7, the matter to be stricken out being as follows:

"For transportation of mail by pneumatic tube, or other similar devices, by purchase or otherwise, \$725,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. THROPP) there were—ayes 87, noes 50.

Accordingly, the amendment to strike out was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inland transportation by railroad routes, of which a sum not exceeding \$40,000 may be employed to pay freight on postal cards, stamped envelopes, and stamped paper, and other supplies from the manufactories to the post-offices and depots of distribution, \$33,870,000.

Mr. BINGHAM. I rise for the purpose of making a request of the House. I have some data upon this question, pertaining to inland railway mail transportation, which I should like to place in the RECORD, and not to delay the House. My remarks will be wholly pertinent to the question, not going outside of it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may have that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] asks unanimous consent to insert some remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For railway post-office car service, \$4,500,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph which the Clerk is just about to read is one on which an hour has been set apart for general debate.

Mr. LOUD. Had not the paragraph better be read?

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, I want to say—

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph has not yet been read.

Mr. TAWNEY. I know it has not been read; but there are several propositions in the paragraph that are subject to a point of order, and I desire to know whether or not, in the event that the whole paragraph is read, the opportunity to raise the point of order to these particular parts of the paragraph will have been lost?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph may be read, with the understanding that the gentleman will make the point of order afterwards.

Mr. TAWNEY. As to any particular item in the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Railway Mail Service: One General Superintendent, at \$3,500; 1 assistant general superintendent, at \$3,000; 1 chief clerk, office of General Superintendent, \$2,000; 11 division superintendents, at \$2,500 each; 11 assistant di-

vision superintendents, at \$1,800 each; 21 assistant superintendents, at \$1,000 each; 85 chief clerks, in charge of lines, at \$1,000 each; 718 clerks, class 5b, at \$1,400 each; 479 clerks, class 5a, at \$1,300 each; 938 clerks, class 4b, at \$1,200 each; 694 clerks, class 4a, at \$1,150 each; 3,405 clerks, class 3, at \$1,000 each; 2,187 clerks, class 2, at \$900 each; 525 clerks, class 1, at not exceeding \$800 each.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to reserve the point of order on this paragraph; but pending that, I desire to state to the chairman of the committee that it is my purpose to offer as a substitute for this provision the bill for the reclassification of the railway postal clerks, known as H. R. 2, upon which, of course, the chairman of the Post-Office Committee will make the point of order. At least, he has indicated his purpose so to do. Now, I ask that the points of order as to both propositions be reserved; and that both propositions be discussed on their merits, with a view to determining which is most equitable and just and which shall go out of the bill.

Mr. LOUD. That seems to be a very fair proposition. Mr. Chairman, but I shall have to insist on the gentleman making his point of order on this paragraph before we go any further, in order that we may know where we are.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman will not insist upon that, as an hour has been set apart for general debate upon this paragraph. I simply wanted to reserve the right to make the point of order as to this paragraph at the end of the discussion instead of now. That was my only object.

Mr. LOUD. I am sorry to say to the gentleman that personally I could not make that agreement with him. If he wants to raise the point of order against this paragraph, I insist that it should be made before the debate comes on this subject; and if it is to go out, it had better go out, and then we will know where we are.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, is it competent to do this by the unanimous consent of the committee—that is, that the question of whether or not this paragraph is in order be pending during the discussion of the bill and the proposition which I intend to offer as a substitute for it? If it is, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the question of whether or not this paragraph is in order be pending and considered at the expiration of the time allowed for general debate on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may reserve the point of order upon the paragraph just read until after the discussion thereof at the end of the hour. Is there objection?

Mr. LOUD. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made by the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent for this, that the present paragraph and H. R. No. 2 be considered as pending, and that they be submitted to a vote in this committee at the expiration of one hour's debate.

The CHAIRMAN. House bill No. 2, the Chair will say, is not before the committee in any shape or form.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I then offer the following as a substitute for the paragraph which has just been read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. That was contained in my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. TAWNEY. Reserving the point of order, and to be inserted after the word "each," on line 10, page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers the following, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "each," line 10, page 16, the following:

"That on and after the 1st day of July, 1900, employees of the Post-Office Department known as railway postal clerks shall be divided into ten classes and be paid according to the following rates per annum: First class, not exceeding \$800; second class shall receive \$900; third class shall receive \$1,000; fourth class shall receive \$1,100; fifth class shall receive \$1,200; sixth class shall receive \$1,300; seventh class shall receive \$1,400; eighth class shall receive \$1,500; ninth class shall receive \$1,600; tenth class shall receive \$1,800."

"The Postmaster-General may, however, at his discretion, temporarily reduce the salary of any clerk as a penalty for delinquency or misconduct in such sum as he may deem necessary for the maintenance of discipline and efficient service; such reductions to be based upon a demerit system, which shall be uniform throughout the service."

"That the original appointments to the position of railway postal clerk shall be made to class 1 for a probationary period of six months from the date of the same, less such time as the appointee may have performed service as a substitute clerk, as provided by the postal laws and regulations and the civil-service laws and regulations; and no permanent appointment shall be made before the expiration of the probationary period, and then only when the appointee shall have shown himself proficient in his duties, fully competent to perform the same, and has made a satisfactory record."

"Promotions shall be based solely upon efficiency, faithfulness, and good conduct, and the clerk must serve at least six months in each class before being promoted to a higher class: Provided, That on lines upon which full railway post-office cars have been authorized by the Postmaster-General a clerk appointed to a crew of five or more shall, after having passed the probationary period, be appointed a clerk of class 2, and if he proves himself proficient in his duties and has made a satisfactory record, he shall, within a year after receiving his permanent appointment, be promoted to class 3, and shall not be further promoted unless there is a vacancy in a higher class; but if he is appointed to a crew of two, three, or four clerks, and continues to make a satisfactory record, then he shall be advanced one grade each year until he shall have reached the maximum class of the lowest grade in the car to which he is assigned, as hereinafter provided for."

"On lines upon which full railway post-office cars have not been authorized



by the Postmaster General, where but one clerk to a car is appointed to perform the duties and who runs an average of 110 miles or more per day, he shall be of class 5.

"If the daily average of miles run is less than 110 and not less than 100, the clerk shall be of class 4; if less than 100 and not less than 90, the clerk shall be of class 3; if less than 90 and more than 80, the clerk shall be of class 2. If the average distance run is 80 miles or less, the clerk shall be of class 1, and the salary shall not be less than \$10 per annum for each mile of the daily average of miles run: *Provided*, That the clerks of these classes, assigned as above, are employed exclusively by the Post-Office Department.

"On lines upon which full railway post-office cars have not been authorized by the Postmaster-General, where more than one clerk is assigned to duty in a car, the additional clerks shall be of classes lower than the clerk in charge, except where the clerk in charge is of class 1, and in no case shall such additional clerks be of a class higher than class 4. Where helpers are assigned to duty on such lines they shall not be of a class higher than class 3.

"On lines upon which full railway post-office cars are run by the order of the Post-Office Department, and to which 2 clerks to a crew are assigned, there shall be 1 clerk of class 8 and 1 clerk of class 6 or lower, as hereinbefore provided for.

"On lines upon which full railway post-office cars are run by order of the Post-Office Department, and to which 3 clerks to a crew are assigned, there shall be 1 clerk of class 8, 1 clerk of class 6, 1 clerk of class 5, and 1 clerk of class 4 or lower, as hereinbefore provided for.

"On lines upon which full railway post-office cars are run by order of the Post-Office Department, and to which 4 clerks to a crew are assigned, there shall be 1 clerk of class 8, 1 clerk of class 6, 1 clerk of class 5, 1 clerk of class 4, and others of class 3 or lower, as hereinbefore provided for.

"On lines where more than one distributing car is run in a train there shall be 2 additional clerks of class 6 for each additional distributing car. The clerk receiving the highest salary in any crew will be designated clerk in charge.

"Clerks employed on steamboat lines shall be of class 1; the salary to be determined by the amount of work to be performed and whether they are employed exclusively by the Post-Office Department.

"Clerks employed as porters in railway post-offices shall be of class 1 and shall be paid a salary not exceeding \$500 per annum.

"The General Superintendent may, when necessary, detail clerks of such classes as the character of the work may indicate to duty at important railway junctions; such clerks to be designated as transfer clerks in charge and assistant transfer clerks; and it shall be their duty to look after the handling and transfer of mails at railroad depots and perform such other work pertaining to the Railway Mail Service as may be required of them. When more than one clerk is needed for such duty at the same depot, the additional clerks shall be of classes below class 7, but in no case shall more than one clerk of the same class, above class 3, be so detailed at the same depot.

"Such clerks as may be assigned to duty in charge of one or more lines shall be of class 9, and be designated as chief clerks, and shall, when traveling on business of the Department, be paid from the appropriations for the transportation of mails on railroads their actual and necessary expenses, but not exceeding \$3 per diem.

"There shall be one clerk detailed to duty in the office of each division superintendent, who shall be designated assistant division superintendent, Railway Mail Service, and who shall act as division superintendent in the absence of that officer. Such clerk shall be of class 10, and shall, when traveling on the business of the Department, be paid from the appropriation for the transportation of mails on railroads his actual and necessary expenses, but not exceeding \$3 per diem.

"There may be detailed to duty in the office of the General Superintendent and of each division superintendent of Railway Mail Service as many railway postal clerks, in the judgment of the General Superintendent, as may be necessary to transact the business of those offices properly; but there shall be but one clerk of class 10 detailed to duty in the office of each division superintendent.

"That all railway postal clerks whose duties require them to work six days or more per week, fifty-two weeks per year, shall be allowed an annual vacation of fifteen days with pay.

"No clerk shall receive less salary after the passage of this act than he was receiving prior thereto, and no clerk shall be reduced from a higher to a lower grade after his assignment thereto unless such salary or grade is properly reduced by reason of his inefficiency to perform the duties of such higher grade, unless temporarily reduced as a penalty for delinquency or misconduct, as hereinbefore provided for, or unless the status of the line to which he is assigned may be so changed by the reduction of mileage, withdrawal of full railway post-office cars, reduction of force, or otherwise, as to bring him within a different class, as provided in this act, or unless he be transferred from one line to another at his own request or in the interest of the public service."

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I want to renew my request for unanimous consent that this amendment be considered as pending, that an hour's debate be given to it, and at the end it be submitted to the House for its action.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that this proposition has been given an hour for general discussion, that by having both propositions before the committee, the gentleman reserving the point of order he has made and I reserving the point of order on the paragraph which he has reported, the entire subject will be before the committee, and we will have an opportunity of considering the relative merits of those propositions. If the Chair strikes out the proposition which I have offered on the point of order, then the question will come up on the provision which the gentleman has reported in this bill.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman is holding a post-mortem. We have commenced debate, and you have offered an amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. I reserved the point of order pending the reading of the amendment.

Mr. LOUD. You did?

Mr. TAWNEY. And so stated to the Chair at the time of offering it.

Mr. LOUD. I stated that I insisted upon the point of order being determined.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. But it was not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LOUD. Let us see what the Chairman says about that. The Chair does not hold that a point of order can be reserved when a gentleman insists that it shall be determined.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course a point of order could not be reserved by the gentleman from Minnesota against the objection of the gentleman from California. It can only be reserved by unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did not understand the gentleman from California objected when I said I reserved the point of order, when I offered my proposition as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California had insisted that the point of order should be determined, and thereupon the gentleman from Minnesota offered an amendment.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Did the Chairman decide the point of order then?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was not discussed at all. The gentleman submitted his amendment.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Was it decided?

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman must have—

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair has not decided any point of order.

Mr. LOUD. What I thought I heard the gentleman say was that he withdrew it.

Mr. TAWNEY. No, no. Then, I ask the gentleman from California to reserve the point of order on the amendment until the expiration of the hour's discussion.

Mr. LOUD. Now, I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I am perfectly willing to do that on this amendment—the gentleman's proposition here to this section—if that is the last of it.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is all there is of it.

Mr. LOUD. The only object I have is that I would like to have it determined before we proceed to debate what we are going to vote upon; and if this is all the gentleman's proposition, I will reserve the point of order. I understand that is all of your proposition.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will state to the gentleman from California that the amendment which I have offered is offered as a substitute for all that part of the paragraph which has been read after the word "each," in line 10, down to the end of that paragraph.

Mr. BINGHAM. On what page?

Mr. TAWNEY. On page 16 of the bill. The proposition which I have offered as a substitute is the reclassification bill, known as H. R. No. 2. That is the only proposition except, in the event that this should go into the bill, it would be necessary to change the figures on page 17 as to the aggregate appropriation.

Mr. LOUD. I want to suggest to the gentleman that there is one hour set aside for debate. Is the gentleman willing to divide that hour?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly; that is the proposition.

Mr. LOUD. I ask that the gentleman from Minnesota control one half of the time and I control the other half.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out all after the word "each," in line 10, to the end of the paragraph and substitute the amendment as read. Against that the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] reserves all points of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the two propositions now under consideration relate to the most important branch of our postal service—the railway postal clerks. In almost every city the telephone and messenger service have in a large degree taken the place of the postal service for local communication and the transmission of local messages. But for those who can not avail themselves of these more modern facilities, or whose business or interests demand the speedy transmission of mail matter, the highest possible efficiency in the railway postal service is of the utmost importance. No branch of the postal service has shown such marvelous development and progress in the last fifteen years as has this particular branch of that service.

This progress, this development, and the splendid Railway Mail Service we now have are due almost wholly to the intelligence, industry, and vitality of the men charged with the duty of handling our enormous mails while shut up in their railway post-offices, traveling at the highest possible rate of speed. In no Department of the Government service are the employees required to perform as many hours of continuous labor. In no Department of the Government service do employees assume the risk and danger assumed by railway postal clerks.

In no Department of the public service are the employees required to observe as strict rules and regulations, nor are they subjected to as severe discipline as they are in this service. In no Department of the Government service are the employees required to defray their expenses while traveling and away from their homes in the discharge of their duties, except in the Railway Mail Service. And in no Department of the Government service are

employees denied the privileges of citizens by reason of their service, nor are they denied the comforts and pleasure of home and association with their families to the extent that these privileges are denied to the railway postal clerks.

For many years the Department and the railway postal clerks have asked Congress to take all these things into consideration and reclassify this service and readjust their salaries, so as to meet the growing demands of the service and reasonably compensate these men for the increased labor, the increased danger, incident to the demand of the people for the rapid transit of their mail.

Thus far their appeal has received no consideration whatever at the hands of Congress nor at the hands of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. The proposition which I have offered as a substitute for the one reported by the committee has twice passed the Senate, but in both instances has it failed to receive any consideration at the hands of the House.

I assert here and now that there is no class of Government employees who are harder worked or poorer paid than the men who are employed in this particular branch of the service. And no other class of Government employees has ever asked for an increase in their compensation whose appeal has met with such universal approval on the part of the people and on the part of the public press as the appeal of these men. Almost every newspaper of any prominence throughout the country has given their request the most hearty editorial indorsement.

Twenty years ago any man of any clerical capacity or business ability could in a very brief space of time master the duties of a then so-called "route agent." It is different now. It takes a bright man, a man of good education. It requires years to acquire the requisite expertness to become an expert railway mail clerk under our present system. It is a hard life, exacting, and in a majority of cases slavish. The employees of the Government in the Executive Departments of this city go to their offices at 9 o'clock in the morning. They work until 12, when they are allowed one-half hour for luncheon. They return to their offices and continue their work until 4, and then are free to employ the remainder of their time during that day and until the next morning at 9 o'clock as they may see fit. When they reach the offices in the morning they are clean; papers are all properly arranged; they have nothing to do but commence the discharge of their routine duties.

When the hour of 4 o'clock arrives they leave their desks, and laborers and messengers see to it that their offices are put in proper condition for them to resume the discharge of their duties on the following morning. It is not so with the railway postal clerk. He goes into his car, combining the laborer and, in intelligence, the highest type of the clerical force of the Government. He has no one to handle his heavy sacks of mail for him. He has no one to clean up his car when he leaves it. That duty, by the rules and regulations, he must perform himself. He must even take care of every particle of scrap paper as he goes along in the discharge of his duties, putting it into a sack and then sorting it when he reaches his destination.

In hundreds of instances they are required to do continuous work for twenty hours, and then, with only a short rest, start back on the return trip. In addition to all of his labor, in addition to the mental and physical strain upon him, when on duty, occasioned by the rapid and swaying motion of the train, he must, during his lay-off periods, apply himself to study in order to familiarize himself for the better discharge of his duties in this service.

A first-class clerk must be an expert, and in his periodical examinations must average 98 per cent or better in order to hold his position. These examinations include full knowledge of all rail and star routes within his district, of all railroad connections, on whatever lines mail matter will reach its destination the quickest; the name and location of every post-office in his district, which comprises in many instances from three to twenty-five States and Territories. In addition to all this, within the past two years he has been charged with the duty of making up mail in his car for distribution in our large cities, so that when the mail arrives in the city of Washington, for instance, all mail to be delivered in a certain carrier's district, or at a certain station or substation, must be ready for the carrier.

The proposition which I have offered as a substitute is the bill known as H. R. 2, or the reclassification bill, which has been recommended for passage by the Postmaster-General during the Administration of Mr. Cleveland, and has been repeatedly recommended for passage by the Postmaster-General under our present Administration. It also has the united support of every railway postal clerk in the United States. It deals justly by these men, who, in addition to their unremitting toil and never-ending study of the "schemes," instructions, and regulations, are under bonds as the temporary custodians of vast values, and for this reason the proposition should, in my judgment, be incorporated in this bill as a substitute for the one proposed by the committee.

It does not discriminate against any railway postal clerk or

against any class of these employees, as does the proposition of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD]. It does not increase the salaries of a few, allowing the salaries of the remainder to stand where they were fixed almost twelve years ago, when this service was comparatively in its infancy, when a full railway post-office was unknown, when there were not to exceed five men in any railway postal crew, while to-day we have solid postal trains with five and six full post-office cars and crews numbering as high as twenty-five men.

The proposition reported by the committee and which is now urged by the distinguished chairman [Mr. LOUD] is unjust, inequitable, and will necessarily tend to create dissatisfaction and demoralize the service. This is so because he arbitrarily subdivides two classes, increasing the salaries of a portion of each of these classes and denies any increase whatever to the remainder of these two classes. The men in these classes all perform the same duties, they run over the same route, they travel the same distance, and to increase the salary of one and not the other will inevitably lead to dissatisfaction and result in injury to the service.

In opening the debate on this appropriation bill on Monday the chairman of the committee [Mr. LOUD], knowing that this was one of the most serious objections to his proposition, undertook to make the House believe that this would not be its effect. I hope the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads will remain, as I intend to call attention to a statement he made yesterday as to the effect of this provision in relation to railway postal clerks and the increase of their salaries. This is not a question of sentiment. If it was, we could confidently appeal to the extra hazardous character of their employment, the large number of clerks annually injured or killed in the service, and the loss of the many comforts and pleasures of home and family which they sustain, in support of that question. It is a question of justice and right, and therefore we need rely only upon the facts to justify our position. I shall appeal to the judgment of this House and not to sentiment.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] interrupted the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and asked him concerning the effect of this particular provision, and wanted to know whether or not it was his understanding that this provision increased the salaries of the railway postal clerks all along the line, or whether it discriminated in favor of some and against others. This was the answer of the gentleman from California:

The promotion of those 748 clerks from the \$1,300 class to the \$1,400 class makes substantially the same increase down along the whole line—perhaps not in the exact number; that I can not say. This is a very intricate question. I do not suppose anyone outside the General Superintendent and his assistant could give exactly the number. But the bill provides for a general lifting up along the whole line—that is, if you lift up the top the rest must follow.

Then, he says the increased appropriation for railway postal clerks is about \$900,000.

Now, from this statement I take it that the distinguished chairman of the committee in charge of this bill intended to do substantial justice to all classes of the Railway Mail Service, and I confidently hope and expect that when it is shown to him conclusively, as it can be, that instead of increasing the salaries of the railway postal clerks by \$900,000, the increase is only \$140,000, and that when he says he is lifting up all the railway postal clerks, he is benefiting only 21 per cent at the expense of the remaining 79 per cent, he will then consent to the proposition I have offered and which will accomplish what he says he and his committee intended to accomplish by this provision in the bill.

He also repeated that same statement in answer to a question put to him by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], and I submit to him and to the committee that unintentionally he has misled the members of this House in respect to the actual effect of his provision. As a matter of fact, as I have said, he increases the appropriation of salaries of railway postal clerks only \$140,000 instead of about \$900,000.

[Here the committee rose to receive a message from the Senate.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying when the committee rose, if the distinguished chairman of the committee intended to increase the appropriation for the railway postal clerks, as he said in his speech on Monday last, \$965,000—

Mr. LOUD. "The gentleman from California" did not make any such statement, and the gentleman from Minnesota has no right to misinterpret any remark that I made.

Mr. TAWNEY. I read from the RECORD of April 23, page 4565, in which this statement was made by the chairman of the committee:

The increase for railway mail clerks this year is \$965,000.

Mr. LOUD. That is very true, but not the increase of salaries. Do not misinterpret me.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did not say for salaries. I will read further what the gentleman said:

In this segregation that we have made there is probably about \$500,000 for increase of salaries of the railway mail clerks.

Mr. LOUD. I said that.



Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman intended to give or believed that he was giving this increase of \$500,000 for increased salaries, and if he believed that he was increasing the salaries, as he said, "all along the line," I repeat that if he can be convinced that his provision will not accomplish either of these two results, then, being, as I know him to be, a fair-minded man, he ought to accept the proposition I have offered, for that will accomplish both results.

Now, let us see whether the gentleman has increased this appropriation \$500,000 for increase of salaries of these clerks. Here is an analysis of that provision of the appropriation bill prepared by the statistician in the Railway Mail Service, which I will print as part of my remarks.

Statement showing increase of salaries under the Post-Office appropriation bill (H. R. 10301).

Items.	Salary.	In-crease salary.	Num-ber.	Annual rate.
General Superintendent Railway Mail Service	\$3,500	-----	1	*\$3,500
Assistant General Superintendent	3,000	-----	1	*3,000
Chief clerk, office General Superintendent	2,000	-----	1	*2,000
Division superintendents	2,500	-----	11	*27,500
Assistant superintendents	1,600	-----	21	*33,600
Assistant division superintendents	1,800	\$200	11	*19,800
Chief clerks in charge of lines	1,600	200	85	133,000
Class 5b clerks on night lines	1,400	100	748	1,047,200
Class 5a clerks on day lines	1,300	-----	479	622,700
Class 4b clerks on night lines	1,200	50	938	1,125,000
Class 4a clerks on day lines	1,150	-----	694	798,100
Class 3	1,000	-----	3,405	3,405,000
Class 2	900	-----	2,187	1,968,300
Class 1, not exceeding	800	-----	525	420,000
Granting annual leaves	-----	-----	-----	50,000
For acting clerks in place of injured	-----	-----	-----	25,000
Expenses of chief clerks and railway postal clerks	-----	-----	-----	15,000
Expenses of General Superintendent, assistant general superintendent, and division superintendents	-----	-----	-----	*25,000
Per diems, etc., of assistant superintendents	-----	-----	-----	*34,000
Total	-----	-----	9,107	19,761,300

Statement showing new classification and salaries under the proposed amendment to bill H. R. 2.

Items.	Salary.	In-crease salary.	Num-ber.	Annual rate.
General Superintendent Railway Mail Service	\$3,500	-----	1	*\$3,500
Assistant General Superintendent	3,000	-----	1	*3,000
Chief clerk, office General Superintendent	2,000	-----	1	*2,000
Division superintendents	2,500	-----	11	*27,500
Assistant superintendents	1,600	-----	21	*33,600
Class 10	1,800	\$200	11	*19,800
Class 9	1,600	200	105	168,000
Class 8	1,500	200	1,207	1,810,500
Class 7	1,400	-----	-----	-----
Class 6	1,300	150	1,632	2,121,600
Class 5	1,200	200	3,251	3,901,200
Class 4	1,100	100	738	812,300
Class 3	1,000	100	1,320	1,320,000
Class 2	900	-----	425	382,500
Class 1 not exceeding	800	-----	328	183,080
Granting annual leaves	-----	-----	-----	50,000
For acting clerks in place of injured	-----	-----	-----	25,000
Expenses chief clerks and railway postal clerks	-----	-----	-----	15,000
Expenses of General Superintendent, assistant general superintendent, and division superintendents	-----	-----	-----	*25,000
Per diems, etc., of assistant superintendents	-----	-----	-----	*34,000
Total	-----	-----	9,107	10,938,180

\* Now paid out of "Transportation of mails by railroads."

† Of this amount \$148,400 paid out of "Transportation of mails by railroads."

Average increase under H. R. 10301 is \$15.31.

Average increase under H. R. 2 is \$150.97.

According to this, there are 11 assistant division superintendents whose salaries are increased \$200 per annum. I also see that the salaries of 85 chief clerks in charge of lines are increased \$200 per annum. I find that a portion of class 5, a class fixed by existing law, have their salaries increased \$100, the exact number being 748. I find, too, that a portion of class 4, a classification fixed by law, have their salaries increased \$50, and the aggregate number receiving an increase of salary is 938. I also find that there is not one man in the Railway Mail Service who will derive any benefit whatever in the way of increase of salary except these. So that there is no general lifting up of salaries "all along the line," as he says, by reason of the increase of salaries of a part of class 5 and a part of class 4. There can be none, for the simple reason that the present classification is fixed by law, which reads as follows:

That persons in the Railway Mail Service known as railway post-office clerks, route agents, local agents, and mail-route messengers shall, on and after the passage of this act, be designated as railway postal clerks, and divided

into five classes, whose salaries shall not exceed the following rates per annum: First class, not exceeding \$800; second class, not exceeding \$900; third class, not exceeding \$1,000; fourth class, not exceeding \$1,200, and fifth class, not exceeding \$1,400.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the present classification, and the salary for each class is likewise fixed by law.

The gentleman pretends to justify his action and will in his reply say that some years ago, because of a deficiency in the appropriation, class 5 did not receive the maximum salary, and that he now proposes to remedy this. In doing this he claims also that he is lifting up all below class 5.

But in order to accomplish that what does he do? By this provision he makes an arbitrary classification. He subdivides class 4 and class 5, which is new legislation, and is just as obnoxious to the rule of this House as the amendment I have offered. There is no "class 5a" or "class 5b" under existing law. There is no "class 4a" and no "class 4b." In these two classes there are a little over 2,800 railway postal clerks. He increases the salaries of about 1,700, and he allows 1,100 or more in the same classes to continue to work at the salary they are now receiving.

As an administrative officer, sir, as a legislator, I appeal to him to say whether in his judgment it is for the interest of the service to discriminate in favor of 1,700 men of a given class and against 1,100 men of the same class?

His proposition is clearly a discrimination in favor of a part of class 4 and class 5. There are no other employees in the railway postal service except the office force who will derive a particle of benefit from the passage of the proposition reported by the committee. This is necessarily so for the reason that the salaries and classifications are fixed by law. The General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service can not "boost up" a man in one class unless there is a vacancy in a higher class.

The proposition of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] does not take anybody out of class 5. It does not take anybody out of class 4. It allows those two classes to remain as they are to-day. It is true he increases the salary of those whom the gentleman arbitrarily calls class 5b and class 4b, but he does not change their present classification. This provision, therefore, can not increase the salary of any clerk in the lower classes until they are transferred from the lower to the higher classes. The proposition of the gentleman [Mr. LOUD] does not and can not affect the salary of any man in the service, except those specifically named or those in classes 4b and 5b.

The proposition, therefore, does not accomplish what the gentleman declared upon the floor of this House to be his purpose. He did not explain or pretend to explain how it was possible for the General Superintendent of the Railway Postal Service to increase salaries of men in classes 3, 2, or 1 or how it was possible for him to increase the salaries of those in classes 4 and 5, whose salaries he does not propose to increase.

This proposition, therefore, I say does not accomplish what the gentleman from California seeks to accomplish. If he is sincere in the statement which he made on the floor of the House on Monday, he should accept my amendment, which does increase the salaries all along the line.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to what the Second Assistant Postmaster-General himself has said in regard to this proposition. Before quoting what he has said I want to state that the proposition I have offered as an amendment has been recommended by the Post-Office Department, and the railway postal clerks have for years endeavored to secure its enactment into law.

They came here in the Fifty-third Congress, they came again in the Fifty-fourth Congress, and their bill was reported to this House, but it could not receive consideration because there was a great deficit in the Treasury at that time. They returned in the Fifty-fifth Congress, backed by all their superior officers, but the war with Spain came on and the necessities of the Government for revenue were so great that the railway postal clerks, in a spirit of patriotism, returned to the discharge of their duties without further pressing their claims in that Congress.

In 1898 the Second Assistant Postmaster-General incorporated in his report the bill which I have offered as a substitute for the committee provision, and he accompanied it with the most hearty and favorable commendation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman who has charge of the bill says that if these assistant division superintendents and chief clerks are promoted, it makes vacancies below them, and thereby in that way lifts up the entire list. Now, can that be done unless you fill up at the bottom with new or different men?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly not; but the mistake the gentleman makes there—

Mr. LOUD. I had hoped that the gentleman from Minnesota would correct the gentleman from Georgia, so that I would not be called on to do it.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to

say that the proposition contained in this appropriation bill does not contemplate the promotion from one class to another of any of the men in the Railway Postal Service. They continue to perform the duties in the classes in which they now are; and if this proposition passes, they will remain in those classes just as now. The only difference will be that 748 men in class 5b will receive an increase of \$100, and 938 men, I think, in class 4b will receive an annual increase of \$50. It does not permit any man—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then it makes no vacancies.

Mr. TAWNEY. It makes no vacancies; and there can be no "lifting up" of the classes below 4 and 5, because nobody is taken out of either one of those two upper classes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General in his last report says, concerning the substitute which I offer for the provisions contained in the appropriation bill:

*Reorganization and reclassification.*—The bill for the reclassification of the clerks of the Railway Mail Service, which has been before Congress for some time and is referred to at length in the report of the General Superintendent, should appeal more strongly than ever to the favorable action of Congress at its coming session. The last reorganization occurred in 1881.

Many important changes have occurred in the service since that date. Present salaries are not equitably adjusted to the nature of the work performed. Higher grades of work call for additional classes to secure proper supervision. In comparing salaries and compensation of the clerical force it must be remembered that salaries of railway postal clerks include the per diem or travel pay. The net compensation, after deducting extraordinary expenses of travel, is in many cases inadequate to support their families and properly educate their children. As a result, applications for transfer to clerical positions in the Department and in the local post-office are numerous and pressing.

Notwithstanding the increased cost of living in a large city, railway postal clerks are willing to accept transfer at a reduction of from \$100 to \$250 per year in salary. Several such transfers have been made to this office within the past year. Clerks in local positions are at home with their families. They avoid the risks incident to exposed travel; save wear and tear of clothes and other incidental expenses. In foreign countries a specific allowance is made to all officials and clerks who travel. In Great Britain railway postal clerks are taken chiefly from the London office, and when under such detail receive from 30 to 80 per cent increase in salary.

Mark! When they are taken out of the London post-office and put upon the road to discharge the duties which our railway postal clerks are discharging, they are given an increase in salary of from 30 to 80 per cent, which shows how the labor in this branch of the postal service is regarded in comparison with the labor in the office by European countries, and should be regarded by the American Government.

In France a specific allowance for travel expenses ranges from \$140 to \$300 a year, which amounts to from 15 to 40 per cent increase in their regular salaries. In Germany a graduated allowance is made based on the number of miles traveled, number of hours at lie-over points, etc. Indeed, in the case of all other Government officials and clerks in this country the necessary traveling expenses are provided for by an allowance of from \$2 to \$4 per day.

Not a dollar is allowed to a railway postal clerk for travel subsistence, although when he is on duty he is away from home half the time, incurring the same expenses that other employees of the Government incur; but he is not reimbursed for a dollar of that expense, while every other employee of the Government who goes out of his office, and performs duties outside of that office, is reimbursed for the expenses incurred incident thereto. Not so with our railway postal clerks. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General further says:

If the present salaries of our clerks seem higher than those prevailing in foreign countries, it must be remembered that the amount of work performed by 1 clerk in our service equals the work of 2 and sometimes of nearly 3 clerks in European countries. For instance, the number of railway post-office cars reported in France is 468, and the number of clerks performing service in them 2,852, an average of over 6 clerks per car. As compared with this, in our country we have 7,662 railway postal clerks performing the service in 3,506 cars and apartments, an average of 2.18 clerks per car.

Contrasted, Mr. Chairman, either in regard to the amount of compensation or in regard to the amount of labor required there are no postal clerks in the service of any civilized country to-day who receive less compensation, deducting the expenses which they must necessarily incur, than the railway postal clerks of the United States. I have here a statement showing just what the average salaries are.

The average salary of each one of the 9,061 clerks under the proposed bill—that is, the estimates for the next fiscal year (the proposition which I have submitted is based on the needs of the service for the next fiscal year)—is \$1,037.43, and the average salary under the provision presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. Loud] is \$1,060.91, while under the proposition which I have submitted as a substitute for this proposition the average salary will be only \$1,175.35. So that under the reclassification proposed by the committee the average annual salary would be \$23.48 more than they are now receiving, while under the proposition which I have submitted as a substitute the average salary would be \$114 more than under the committee's proposition and only \$137.93 more than they are now receiving.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these statements are all verified by the statement furnished by the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service and prepared by the statistician of that Department, which is the statement I have before referred to. It was prepared at my request for the purpose of analyzing and enabling members of this

House to fully understand both propositions and then determine from the facts which of the two is the more just, which of the two provides for an equitable division of the appropriation made by the Government for the purpose of compensating them for their services.

Mr. BROMWELL. Will it interrupt the gentleman for me to make a request at this time?

Mr. Chairman, in view of the interest we all take in this matter, and the fact that a great deal is being presented that will be of value to the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads when this matter comes before that committee for consideration, I ask unanimous consent that the time for discussion of the proposed amendment shall be extended one hour, half an hour to be controlled on each side by the same gentlemen that have the control of the debate that has already been agreed to.

Mr. LOUD. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman will not insist on that. I will yield to the gentleman part of the time that I have. I do not care to beat the air myself particularly, and I will yield a great deal of my share of the time to gentlemen to speak in reference to an amendment that they know can not pass.

Mr. BROMWELL. Whether it can pass or not, it is a matter of a great deal of importance to others.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to get through with this bill before Friday. The gentleman knows that Friday will be wanted for pensions.

Mr. BROMWELL. I have no doubt that we will get to a vote to-morrow.

Mr. LOUD. I fear from the way that we are progressing that we will not get through before next winter.

Mr. BROMWELL. I would like to have my request submitted, but from what the gentleman says it seems he will object; but I renew my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend the time for debate on this paragraph one hour, thirty minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota and thirty minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from California. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed fifteen minutes' time in addition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he be allowed fifteen minutes in addition.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope my colleague will not ask that. I think he can get all the time he wants from the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOUD. What is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he be allowed fifteen minutes in addition to the time already given. Is there objection?

Mr. LOUD. I shall not object if the House wants to extend the time for a month. That is for the House to determine. If you want to sit on this bill all summer, that is for the House to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to make clear to the members of the Committee the difference between the proposed reclassification of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads and the proposition proposed by the Department and the railway mail clerks, I will restate what I said a moment ago relative to the effect of the committee bill. That it increases the salaries of 11 superintendents, \$200; 85 chief clerks in charge of lines, \$200; 740 clerks of class 5, \$100, and 938 clerks of class 4, \$50. Out of a total of 9,107 railway postal clerks this provision will benefit 2,800 of them.

Under the proposition which I have submitted you would increase the salaries of class 10, the chief clerks in charge of lines, \$200; class 9, \$200, and there are only 105 in this class; class 8, \$200; there are 1,207 in that class; class 6—and I wish to say here that I omit class 7, because there are no employees in class 7 at this time. The proposition which the Department proposes, and which the railway postal clerks favor, is to create another class, to meet an emergency that has existed for a long time—namely, the appointment of transfer clerks in our large cities; and they propose that these transfer clerks shall hereafter be designated as class 7 instead of being known as transfer clerks. Then class 6 is increased \$150; there are 1,632 in this class. Class 5, one of the hardest-worked classes in the service, where there is only one man to a car, and a class in which there are 3,251, the increase is \$200.

Class 4, the increase is \$100, and there are 793 in that class. Class 3, the increase is \$100, and there are 1,320 in that class. Class 2 and class 1, their salary is not increased at all, for the reason that in the judgment of the Department and the clerks the salary fixed by law for these two classes is an adequate compensation for the service they render upon entering the service. So that under this provision we benefit 91 per cent of all the clerks, while under the committee's provision we benefit only 21 per cent. We benefit, in other words, under the provision which I have submitted, all the employees in the Railway Postal Service who, in the judgment of



the Department and in the opinion of the clerks themselves, are entitled to any increase of salary; while under the committee's proposition we discriminate in favor of one-third and against the remaining two-thirds.

Now, what is the aggregate result? The aggregate amount of this appropriation reported by the committee is \$9,761,800, and in the proposed division of that appropriation among these clerks we will injure the service by discriminating against 79 per cent of the men in that arm of the service. Under the amendment I have offered we would divide that appropriation equitably and do justice to all of them, and then only make their average salary \$1,175.43. This would increase the appropriation only \$1,233,880 over the amount proposed by the committee.

Mr. GAINES. Why do they make this invidious distinction between the 91 per cent and the 21 per cent?

Mr. TAWNEY. I can not explain to the gentleman why they make the invidious distinction that he refers to.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. It has been some time since I looked over this part of the bill which the gentleman offers as a substitute, and so I am not as familiar with its provisions as I ought to be. I see on page 2 it says that promotions shall be based solely upon efficiency, faithfulness, and good conduct, and the clerk must serve at least six months in each class, etc. Before that I find there is to be a probationary appointment of six months in the lowest class—class 1. Now, at the end of six months does the bill provide that, having served his probation, he shall then be promoted to class 2?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. BROMWELL. And at the end of another probationary period he shall be promoted to the next—class 3?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; he may be, but he would not be entitled to the second promotion at the expiration of that period as a matter of right.

Mr. BROMWELL. But beyond class 3 he shall not be promoted unless there are vacancies?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is as I understand it.

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, what would be the effect of this if there were no deaths or removals in class 3? Will it not require the appointment of new clerks in classes 1 and 2 to fill the vacancies caused by promotions of those in classes 1 and 2 to class 3? In other words, will there be a lot of supernumerary appointments in the two lowest classes to take the place of promotions into class 3?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; that is not my understanding. I asked the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service this morning and he informs me that will not be the effect of it; that when the promotions are made in the higher classes, these men, if there are many in the lower classes, will be promoted into the higher classes from classes 1 and 2, and when vacancies occur in classes 1 and 2, they will fill them by examination as they fill all other positions under this bill.

Mr. BROMWELL. The gentleman will recognize the difference between classes from 3 up and classes 1 and 2. From 3 up there can not be a transfer from the lower classes unless there is a vacancy. Classes 1 and 2, on the other hand, are on probationary service that entitles them to promotion. Now, in case there are only a few vacancies in classes 3 and above, and a large number in classes 1 and 2, will not the result be that you will double classes 1 and 2 by the transfers into upper classes and make it necessary to put new men into classes 1 and 2 where the service does not require it?

Mr. TAWNEY. Superintendent White assures me that the bill does not operate in that way.

But, however that may be, I feel quite confident that the committee of this House will be justified in relying upon the judgment of the Department, and that the Department and the clerks having worked out this reclassification to their satisfaction, we may confidently accept their judgment.

Mr. HOPKINS. As I understand, the increase of salaries provided for in this appropriation bill has not been recommended by the Department, and does not represent the wishes of the clerks.

Mr. TAWNEY. It has been recommended by the Department for the last three years. I mean this substitute offered by myself has the full and entire approval of the Department.

Mr. HOPKINS. I am talking about the bill presented by the committee.

Mr. TAWNEY. No; that is not recommended by the Department.

Mr. HOPKINS. The substitute offered by you has been approved of by the Department and by the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; the bill offered by me was incorporated in the Second Assistant Postmaster-General's report in 1898, and referred to again with approval in the report of 1899.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not a fact that it meets with the approval

of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, and men all along the line?

Mr. TAWNEY. All of them, every one of them, from class 10 down. I want to call attention to a statement which was made by the chairman of the committee on Monday, that by this segregation the aggregate increase of salary is \$300,000.

To explain this I would invite your attention to this remarkable fact: In order to make it appear that he was giving an aggregate increase of \$500,000, the gentleman includes the salaries of the General Superintendent, of the assistant general superintendent, of the chief clerk in the office of the General Superintendent, the division superintendent, the assistant division superintendent, all of which salaries have heretofore been paid out of the fund for the transportation of the mail by railroads—never before included in the general appropriation bill. The gentleman includes \$148,400 heretofore paid out of the fund for transportation of the mail, and then on the floor of this House undertakes to charge that amount to the railway postal clerks as an increase of salary.

Now, the chairman of the committee said a moment ago that he "did not want to beat the air." Yes, as a friend near me suggests, he wanted to "beat" the railway mail clerks instead of beating the air. I suppose he referred to the fact that the Chairman of this committee would rule this proposition out of order. On that point I call the attention of members of the House to this fact: He knows as well as I do—as well as the Chairman of this Committee of the Whole and other members of this House—that his proposition is as obnoxious to the rule as the proposition which I have offered.

I want to ask the members of this House whether it is a greater crime for a member sitting in his committee room to violate the rule in order to discriminate against about 7,000 railway postal clerks for the sake of benefiting only 1,700 than it is for us, sitting in Committee of the Whole, to violate the rule of the House in order to do absolute and complete justice to all of them. Wherein is the distinction? That rule is violated by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads and by the Appropriations Committee every time they incorporate in an appropriation bill a provision which is either new legislation or which increases appropriations beyond the amount fixed by law. That is done in this very provision. That is why I wanted to reserve the point of order on the paragraph and thereby put both propositions before the House in order that members might determine which of the two was the more equitable, the more just, and calculated to benefit the service most.

But the gentleman refused me that opportunity. I was therefore forced to abandon the point of order, so as to get any consideration of this proposition at all. And I think that if we vote to put my amendment in the bill as a substitute for his proposition, we are simply voting to strike out something which is as obnoxious to the rule as the substitute and to put something in its place that is infinitely better. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that that rule is no more sacred in this House or in the Committee of the Whole than it is in the committee rooms of the House; and if the committee can violate the rule with impunity, I can not see why we can not violate it when we see that an absolute injustice is being done by the violation of the rule in the committee room.

I want to call attention, further, to this remarkable fact: The chairman of the committee stated on Monday in his opening address that the railway postal clerks were the best paid men in the service of the Government. We all know the discomforts and hardships they must endure; we are aware of the danger and risk they assume. It is not necessary for me to dwell on this branch of the question to prove the unusual character of their employment. This is not a question of sentiment; it is a question of justice and equity, and a question of business. Let us examine the provisions of the bill reported by the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and ascertain whether his own bill will sustain his assertion that the railway postal clerks are the best paid men in the Government service. Here are 14,032 sorters in the post-offices, general-delivery clerks, inquiry clerks, supply clerks, paper distributors, etc., all allowed a salary of \$1,000 a year by this appropriation bill—only \$175 less than the average salary the railway postal clerks would receive under my amendment.

Here are 500 sorters, general-delivery clerks—men who stand at the general-delivery window and hand out the mail—who receive \$1,100 annual salary, only \$75 less than the average salary paid under this proposed amendment of mine to the railway postal clerks; 692 sorters, general-delivery clerks, inquiry clerks, etc., including stenographers, \$1,200 year—\$25 more than the salary of the railway postal clerk, the employee who takes his life in his hand when he shuts himself up in a box car to perform the service which the Government requires when out on his railroad run.

Mr. GAINES. Day and night, too.

Mr. TAWNEY. Day and night at that.

Here are 178 dispatchers, mailing clerks, including stenographers, at \$1,300—\$125 more than the average salary paid to the railway postal clerks.

The gentleman also provides for 125 dispatchers, letter distributors, mailing clerks, etc., including stenographers, \$1,400; and then he provides for 58 stamp clerks, including stenographers, at an annual salary of \$1,600. Compare the salary services and the hours of employment of the employees of the Post-Office, which the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] has provided for so bountifully in his bill, with the salary, service, and nature of employment of the railway mail clerk, or make the comparison in other lines of employment, and the injustice of the Government toward these clerks will be still more manifest.

Take the run from Chicago to Minneapolis, a distance of 423 miles, on train 57. On that train railway postal clerks commence work in the yards at Chicago at 1 p. m., and finish in Minneapolis the following day at 9 a. m. Total hours continuous labor, 20. They are then off duty 7 hours. Returning on train 56, clerks commence work at yards at Minneapolis at 4 p. m.; finish at Chicago the following day at 8 a. m. Total hours continuous duty, 15. This constitutes a round trip, and requires 35 hours of work, consuming 3 days' time, for which clerks receive, fifth class, \$10.80; fourth class, \$9.60; third class, \$8.25.

Engineers, of which there are four changes on same runs, are employed 11 hours on train 57, and 13 hours on train 56, for which they receive \$3.70 per hundred miles, or \$31.22 for the round trip, embracing 24 hours active labor, while the highest grade clerk receives but \$10.80 for the same period, notwithstanding he was on duty 11 hours longer.

Train 58, clerks commence duty at Minneapolis at 12 m.; finish the following day at Chicago at 3 a. m. Hours employed, 15. Off duty 18 hours, returning on train 55.

Train 55. Clerks commence work in yards at Chicago at 9 p. m. and finish at Minneapolis the following day at 4 p. m. Hours on duty, 19. Total time for round trip, 34 hours. Highest compensation, \$10.80. Engineers on same runs are employed 12 hours on train 58 and 12 hours and 50 minutes on train 55. Total hours employed on round trip, 24 hours and 50 minutes. Compensation for same, \$31.22. This, bear in mind, is time actually employed on the road, and does not include time off duty devoted to study, making out reports, checking up schemes, checking up receipts for registered matter handled, or preparing slips for next tour of duty.

This requires on an average about 2½ hours of each day off duty. This average will apply to nearly all clerks in the service.

#### COMPARISON WITH DEPARTMENT CLERKS.

A railway postal clerk on an average trunk line works 14 hours per day one-half the time; that is, he is on the road one-half the time and lays off half the time, or he works, including Sundays, 7 hours per day for 365 days in the year.

In addition to this he is obliged to keep up on his distribution and be prepared to do his work properly.

A Department clerk is allowed 52 Sundays, 7 holidays, 30 days' leave of absence, and 30 days' sick leave. If he uses only half of his sick leave, he will then have for his own purposes 99 days out of the 365. A railway postal clerk works 7 hours per day for 365 days—2,555 hours. Two and one-half hours per day (time off duty) preparing for case examinations, making reports of work done and irregularities that occur on his run, checking up records of registered matter handled, correcting schemes, examining order books, preparing supplies for the next term of duty, 182 days, or a total of 3,010 hours per year.

A Department clerk works 7 hours per day for 267 days, or 1,869 hours per year. A railway postal clerk works 1,141 hours (or 163 days) per year more than the Department clerk, or a year and a half more than his more fortunate brother.

In view of all these facts, how can any man justify paying an office stenographer who works 7 hours a day \$1,600, and then deny to the railway postal clerk, who works continuously 20 hours a day, when on duty, an average annual salary of \$1,175 a year. [Applause.]

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I give notice now that when the bill comes into the House I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on an amendment which affects the eight-hour system as applied to the letter carriers.

In the first session of the Fiftieth Congress the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads reported and Congress passed almost unanimously an act to limit the hours that letter carriers in cities shall be employed per day. The following is the language of that act:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That hereafter eight hours will constitute a day's work for all letter carriers in cities or postal districts connected therewith, for which they shall receive the same pay as is now paid for a day's work of a greater number of hours. If any letter carrier is employed a greater number of hours per day than eight, he shall be paid extra for the same in proportion to the salary now fixed by law.*

This act became a law on May 24, 1888. Notwithstanding the expressed wish of Congress, as contained in this act, that the hours

of labor of this branch of our Government service should be limited to eight per day, the letter carriers did not immediately enjoy the benefits of its provisions because the Post-Office Department, through its officers, in defiance of the expressed will of Congress, deliberately set the act aside.

This defiance was clothed in subtleties and in misconstruction of the law. They compelled the letter carriers to go to the courts for a judicial definition of the language of the act. The effort to misconstrue the act has cost this Government up to date more than \$3,000,000 in overtime claims paid by the United States for time that the letter carriers were forced to work in excess of eight hours per day.

The letter carriers did not appreciate in any way the advantages that apparently came to them because of these large claims. It was the only means within their power whereby an observance of the law could be enforced. Notwithstanding the plain language of the act and the intention of Congress so ably expressed in its consideration as to what was really meant to be accomplished, the ingenuity and skill of the very best talent that the Department could command was employed for years to prevent the operation of the law. That great statesman, since deceased, whose sincerity of purpose in relieving the condition of the letter carriers so endeared his memory to every letter carrier of the United States that they bow with reverence at the mention of his name.

His keen perception and accurate knowledge of the law was shown in this measure, which his own hand drew. It has stood the test of all these years of assault, and no judicial tribunal before whom it has been brought has placed any but the plain construction upon it which he intended it to convey. This was the work and might be said to be part of the crowning efforts of the life of the late Samuel S. Cox.

From 1888, when this act was placed upon our statute book, until 1894, no attempt had been made by the Post-Office Department to observe its provisions, hence the accumulation of the excessive time for which the \$3,000,000 already referred to has been paid.

In 1894 an imperative order was issued by the Postmaster-General forbidding the accumulation of overtime by letter carriers and fixing as a penalty that any officer of the Post-Office Department who permitted overtime to be made would be liable to dismissal from the service. This effectually stopped the accumulation of overtime, showing conclusively that the overtime which had previously accumulated was through the connivance and with the knowledge of the officers of the service who, prior to the order referred to, were not made responsible in any way for it.

By their direction, letter carriers working nine and ten hours per day were compelled to falsify the records of the Department to make it appear that they were only working eight hours per day. When, by order of the Court of Claims, a judicial investigation was made of the records, and the testimony of the officers of the Department in the respective cities was taken under oath, it showed plainly that the records had been falsified with the knowledge and through the connivance of those officers.

After all this experience and just at the time when the letter carriers were being permitted to enjoy the benefits of this eight-hour law, again the Department, through its officers, want to disturb this condition by repealing virtually this eight-hour law and substituting in its stead what is termed a forty-eight hour a week law. This, too, is being done by misrepresentation to the members of this House, by the statements made concerning the amendment and by the methods employed to secure its adoption. They show that the proposed change can not stand investigation. During the consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill yesterday, and while the following provision of this bill was under consideration, quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this transpired:

The Clerk read as follows:

"For pay of letter carriers in new offices entitled to free-delivery service under existing law, \$90,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

"After the word 'dollars,' in line 25, page 12, add 'Provided, That letter carriers may be required to work not exceeding forty-eight hours during the six days of each week, and such number of hours on Sundays as may be required by the needs of the service. And if a legal holiday shall occur on any working day the service performed on said day shall be counted as eight hours, without regard to the time actually employed. If any letter carrier is employed for a greater number of hours than forty-eight during the working days in any week, he shall be paid extra for the same in proportion to the salary fixed by law.'"

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to inquire whether this applies to all post-offices?

Mr. LOUD. It does; and my understanding is that the letter carriers themselves have agreed that this will be an improvement in the method of managing the business of the carrier service, by reason of the fact that on some days the mail is extremely heavy and on other days quite light. This would permit the working of the carriers eight and one-half or nine hours a day; but it is provided that they shall not work more than forty-eight hours during a week. The result would be, as suggested to me by many carriers, that on Saturdays, when the business in our cities is light, they would probably get the afternoon to themselves, that being a short working day of perhaps only four or five hours.



Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the amendment has been offered if it carries the remedy suggested by the gentleman from California. The reason I asked the question is because the amendment is made to a clause in the bill applying to letter carriers in new offices.

Mr. LOUD. My understanding is that it applies to all of the letter carriers. I ask a vote.

The amendment was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman that that provision was passed yesterday without sufficient consideration, and I do not think it would have been passed if it had been properly considered.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I should have raised the point of order against it if I had been present. I was at work in the Committee on Labor.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman propose to ask a separate vote on that provision?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I do.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I trust the gentleman will do so.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Now, in this manner it is proposed to attach to this bill an amendment which has no relevancy whatever to the measure under consideration and, if adopted, will virtually repeal the existing statute enacted by the Fiftieth Congress providing eight hours a day for the work of all letter carriers in the United States.

If this measure had any merit, why was it not made a separate bill? Then hearings could have been given and evidence taken as to its necessity. An opportunity would also have been afforded of placing upon record those who favored this backward step in that great eight hour a day movement, approved by many of the best men in this country. Why adopt such methods as this? Was it to disguise the real purpose of those who seek to promote such legislation? What consistency is there in the rule of this House that has excluded from consideration, in connection with this appropriation bill, many important amendments that were germane to its provisions on the mere point of order that they were new legislation, and would at the same time permit of the adoption of this amendment, which is not only new legislation but repeals an existing statute law.

The provisions of this amendment are also vague and indefinite, as is shown by the fact that while the hours of labor for letter carriers are limited to the forty-eight hours provided for the six working days of each week, no limit of hours is provided for Sunday work, except as the language of this amendment prescribes: "And such number of hours on Sunday as may be required by the needs of the service."

And again, too, the vagueness of the provisions of this amendment is found in its provisions for the work to be performed on a legal holiday that may occur on any working day. This is the language of the amendment:

And if a legal holiday shall occur on any working day the service performed on said day shall be counted as eight hours without regard to the time actually employed.

Hence it will be seen that on Sunday or legal holidays there is no limit fixed by the provisions of this amendment to which letter carriers might not be employed.

While no reasons have been given to the House for this radical change, a hurried inquiry elicits the information that the basis for it is the large amount of time not consumed by letter carriers in the performance of duty each day, and which can not be overcome under the existing statutes because of the infrequency and lack of uniformity in the burdens of mail matter creating what are termed light days and heavy days in the letter-carrier service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I ask five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to continue his remarks for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Very well.

Mr. COWHERD. Has the gentleman any information on the statement which was made that this was advocated and wanted by the carriers themselves?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I challenge any man to produce one letter carrier in the United States who says that he desires this amendment—one man.

This created what are termed "light days" and "heavy days" in the letter-carrier service. This theory as to loss of time to the Government because of lack of work is very much exaggerated, if not purposely misrepresented. It is not due in any sense to the necessity for more latitude in the application of the law which causes this accumulation of undertime.

It is chargeable more directly to the pernicious practice that has grown up of permitting some favored few in every office to enjoy the advantages of having light districts to cover while others, and they are in the great majority, are burdened to the fullest extent of their capacity. The amendment will extend the opportunity of further favoritism in the interests of those who are to be favored, and at the expense of those who have always been required to perform their full task. This is shown conclusively in the evidence submitted in support of this amendment, where the average undertime of all the carriers employed in each city is submitted.

If investigated it will show that the great proportion of that undertime was chargeable to the restricted duties required of some few, while the others are employed every minute of the time permitted by law. If there is any remedy needed to secure the use to the Government of this undertime, why not secure it through a readjustment of the service required from each individual letter carrier at the office where he is employed? There is not an office in this country to-day where letter carriers are employed, and where undertime has accumulated, or where mail has been returned for lack of time to complete a delivery, that all this could not be overcome by a readjustment of the districts apportioned to each letter carrier.

What will be the effect of this amendment upon the service so far as its efficiency to the public is concerned? Let me tell you what will happen: Wherever now the schedule of service provides for two, three, or more trips to be made by a letter carrier, and which is now covered even imperfectly for each of those trips, a schedule of duty will be arranged which will permit of the number of trips now made to be continued only on those heavy days, so called, and on the lighter days whole trips will be dispensed with entirely, so that the carriers may be kept within the time prescribed by this bill. Those who are unfortunate enough to have their mail arrive for delivery at those times and on those days which are considered light and thereby can be dispensed with will be compelled to do without their mail at all, thereby deliberately detaining said mail in order that the work may be completed on the heavier days.

Again, too, what is the necessity for this amendment? By its provisions it is proposed that if any letter carrier is employed for a greater number of hours than forty-eight during the working days in any week, he shall be paid extra for the same in proportion to the salary fixed by law. If that provision was in existence to-day, the Postmaster-General would have the right to employ the letter carriers whatever number of hours would be necessary for them to complete their deliveries any day, and pay them for such extra service, for by the provisions of the existing law letter carriers may be so employed.

Mr. Chairman, I give notice once more that I shall call for a yeay-and-nay vote on this amendment in the House. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the Chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to joint resolution (S. Res. 116) to provide for the administration of civil affairs in Porto Rico pending the appointment and qualification of the civil officers provided for in the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FORAKER, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. COCKRELL as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That there be printed from the stereotype plates now in the Government Printing Office an extra edition of 13,000 copies of Report No. 64 of the Department of Agriculture, entitled "Field Operations of the Division of Soils in 1899," 2,000 copies for distribution by Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, 1,000 copies for distribution by Senators, and 10,000 copies for distribution by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there shall be printed 4,500 copies of Notes on the Spanish-American War, Office of Naval Intelligence, Navy Department, with accompanying papers and documents, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for the use of the Navy Department.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 9824) authorizing the Secretary of War to make regulations governing the running of loose logs, steamboats, and rafts on certain rivers and streams, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

## CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER. With the unanimous consent of the House, the Chair will lay before the House the action of the Senate on the amendments of the House to Senate joint resolution 116, to provide for the administration of civil affairs in Porto Rico pending the appointment and qualification of the civil officers provided for in the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendments to the joint resolution 116 and agree to the conference asked for.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House insist on its amendments to joint resolution 116 and agree to the conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. JONES of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also submits the following action of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 9324) authorizing the Secretary of War to make regulations governing the running of loose logs, steamboats, and rafts on certain rivers and streams.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of War shall have power, and is hereby authorized and directed, to prescribe rules and regulations to govern the floating of loose timber and logs, and sack rafts, so called, of timber and logs and general navigation, on any one or all of the navigable rivers or waterways of the United States, wherever in his judgment such regulations are necessary to equitably adjust and govern the conflicting interests of logging and other forms of navigation; and such regulations, when so prescribed and published, shall have the force of law, and any violation thereof shall be a misdemeanor, and every person convicted of a violation thereof shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$2,500 nor less than \$500, or by imprisonment (in the case of a natural person) for not less than thirty days nor more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That the proper action to enforce the provisions of this section may be commenced before any commissioner, judge, or court of the United States, and such commissioner, judge, or court shall proceed in respect thereto as authorized by law in the case of crimes against the United States.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War may, at any time, alter or modify any rules and regulations prescribed by him under the provisions of this act; and he may rescind such rules and regulations whenever in his judgment the necessity for their continuance no longer exists.

"SEC. 3. That whenever rules and regulations shall have been prescribed by the Secretary of War for any waterway, in pursuance of section 1 of this act, and until such rules and regulations shall have been rescinded by his order, the said waterway shall be exempt from the prohibition contained in section 15 of the river and harbor act approved March 3, 1899, against floating loose timber and logs, or what is known as sack rafts of timber and logs, in streams or channels actually navigated by steamboats.

"SEC. 4. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time is hereby reserved.

"SEC. 5. That this act shall not, nor shall any rules or regulations prescribed thereunder, in any manner affect any civil action or actions heretofore commenced and now pending to recover damages claimed to have been sustained by reason of the violation of any of the terms of said section 15 of the act of March 3, 1899, as originally enacted, or in violation of any other law."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to make regulations governing the running of loose logs and rafts on navigable waters."

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BURTON, Mr. MORRIS, and Mr. LESTER.

## POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed its session, and proceeded with the consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to have the chairman of the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads occupy some of his time.

Mr. LOUD. I do not desire to speak now.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have reserved the balance of my time until you use some of yours.

Mr. LOUD. When I take the floor I shall conclude.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have the affirmative of the proposition, and I suppose I have the right to close the debate.

Mr. LOUD. I think the universal custom of the House gives the closing of the debate to the committee. I never knew it to be otherwise.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand the rule is that when the debate lasts more than one day, that the side having the affirmative of the proposition has the right to close.

Mr. LOUD. I insist that the gentleman use his time, if he wants to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to use the balance of my time, and I do not think it is exactly fair for the gentleman to insist that I shall do so now. I have the right to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Minnesota would have the right to close debate.

Mr. LOUD. Does the Chair think that the committee is not entitled to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN. So far as this proposition is concerned, the burden is on the gentleman from Minnesota, and he is entitled to close debate upon this proposition.

Mr. LOUD. That is the first time I have ever heard of such a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will understand that this debate is proceeding by unanimous consent out of the ordinary rules. Under the ordinary rules the gentleman from Minnesota, as the proponent of the measure now being debated, would have the right to close.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is the same ruling that applies to any of our debates that proceed by unanimous consent for two or three days, but I do not take away from the committee any right that it may have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to close debate on this proposition.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I will not take any great length of time in discussing this proposition. The gentleman has made a good speech on this subject and made a very good presentation of his case. The gentleman, of course, is but human, and when he states his proposition as a lawyer he does not desire to state the weak points of his case; and if perchance he can make his case stronger by stating one part of it, why he simply pursues the course that every other lawyer pursues. Then it is for the other side to present their side of the case.

Now, the gentleman got emphatic when he told you how many hours a day railway mail clerks worked. He cited to you several instances, although I did not follow him closely as to what routes; but he left the impression on this House that the railway mail clerks worked over seventeen hours a day, because he gave the time that was occupied in the run out, in the lay over in these places, and the time of the run back, and yet the gentleman forgot—as all people forget when they desire to argue a case—to state another perhaps important factor in the case. He did not tell this House how much lay over these clerks got when they had completed that run.

Now, I make the statement, without fear of successful contradiction, that there is not a railway mail clerk in service to-day, or ever has been, that averages working eight hours out of twenty-four for thirty days consecutively. I am willing to admit that the railway mail service is a hard service, but it must be admitted, on the other hand, that they are well paid. I have made the statement that they were paid more than any other branch of the postal service, and I reiterate that statement to-day. The gentleman, in his argument, of course took a few of the higher paid officials in the post-offices and attempted to average from that.

Why, the House is not going to be deceived by any statement of that character. You can only strike averages by taking the whole; and the gentleman knows as well as any other man on the floor of this House that the post-office clerks to-day include in their average assistant postmasters, receiving a salary in many instances as high as \$3,000, and that under the law they are not receiving an average of over \$720 a year. And he made the statement here that the railway mail clerks were receiving an average salary of one thousand and—I do not recollect what.

Mr. TAWNEY. A thousand and thirty-seven dollars now, \$1,000 under the proposition of the gentleman, and \$1,175 under my proposition.

Mr. LOUD. And he made some comparisons with the foreign service, and read something from the Second Assistant Postmaster-General or General Superintendent's report. The gentleman forgot to tell you what the pay of the clerks were in the London post-office when they were taken out and put on the train. The maximum salary paid to the postal clerks in the London post-office is 30 shillings a week, and he must work ten years to secure that pay. It is true when they are taken out of the London post-office and put into the railway mail service they do receive an extra allowance to pay for their meals. I do not remember the remainder of his argument.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will read it in his own time, I will furnish it to him.

Mr. LOUD. I do not care anything about what there is there. I have read every word of it. The writer of that article says there was an increase of salary, but he forgot to say how much. I say there is no increase of salary. I know who wrote that article. He was with me in Europe in the investigation of this postal service. They do receive extra compensation—what you would term compensation; it is extra "allowance"—when detailed to perform railway mail service; and I believe if a man here only received 30 shillings a week and was detailed to go on the road, he ought to receive an allowance of fifty to seventy-five dollars a year, which they do allow in those countries.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] says I have deceived this House—not intentionally, he says. When I spoke of



lifting up along the whole line, the gentleman was inclined to be technical. I state again there is an increase along the whole line, or else where comes the increase? The gentleman says there is an increase here of how much?

Mr. TAWNEY. One hundred and forty thousand dollars.

Mr. LOUD. Let us take the increase allowed by Congress for a number of years. The increase for the year 1897 over 1896 was \$306,000 for Railway Mail Service; for 1898 over 1897, \$351,000; for 1899 over 1898, \$325,000; for 1900 over 1899, \$371,000. Now, I did make the statement on the floor of this House that this was the largest increase in amount that ever had been given. Whence comes the amount of \$945,000? Where does it go to when we have never before given an increase greater than \$371,000? Now, the gentleman from Minnesota undertook to convince the House that there is an increase here of only \$140,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. How does the gentleman explain his statement made on Monday that there was \$500,000 increase in the railway postal clerks?

Mr. LOUD. Because, if the gentleman will carefully dissect this—I do not think he can—but if the gentleman who gave you the figures had given you all the facts, you would find that there is an increase in the salaries here of \$500,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. He has given me the facts.

Mr. LOUD. He has given you the facts the way you give the facts. He gave you the facts he wanted to, but he did not give all the facts.

Mr. TAWNEY. Wherein in your bill do you provide for an increase of salaries, except in class 5b and class 4b?

Mr. LOUD. We do not provide for any increase in classes, because we did not propose in that particular to go beyond the present law. I am free to say that I believe \$1,400 is enough for a railway mail clerk. You have my position on that. The Post-Office Committee have more things to contend against, perhaps, than the gentleman from Minnesota knows. He can make a speech on the floor of this House and advocate the increase in salaries of the railway mail clerks, and he would not be responsible if the increase was made.

We can afford among ourselves, if we imagined that there was no reporter here or a single person present in the gallery, to be honest and frank with ourselves. Let us assume for one moment that we are placed in the same position here that we would be placed in in the committee room. As chairman of the Post-Office Committee I shall do my duty fearlessly as I see it. I am a Republican, and I have the interests of the Republican party at stake. I am a citizen of this country, and I have the interests of the whole country at stake.

There is pending, as the gentleman well stated, a bill increasing the salaries of the railway mail clerks, and it has been pending a number of years; not this particular bill, but another bill. Last year was the first time that this bill was ever presented to Congress. Oh, I know the gentleman will deny it.

Mr. TAWNEY. In the Fifty-fourth Congress was it not reported from your committee?

Mr. LOUD. I think the last Congress was the first time this particular bill was ever presented. That bill involves an increase of salaries of the present force in the Railway Mail Service of more than \$1,000,000. There is before the Post-Office Committee a bill to increase the salaries of the post-office clerks, and permit me to say, the most equitable measure for an increase of salaries ever presented to this body. That bill will involve an annual increase of salaries for five years of more than one million and a half dollars a year outside the amount for increase service.

There is a letter carriers' salary bill which proposes an increase of salary to every letter carrier in the country of \$200 a year, and in every city of 75,000 inhabitants and less of \$350 a year. There are over 15,000 letter carriers. You can understand what that means—three million and a half dollars. There is pending before the Post-Office Committee, with a greater backing on the floor of this House and outside of it than any other measure here, and perhaps as equitable a measure as any of them, a bill to increase the salaries of fourth-class postmasters. Most of these provisions are supported by the Department. Another provision supported by the Department, which I am of the opinion this House might pass on the eve of an election—and it is noticed that these questions come up always preceding an election, and at the short session nobody is particularly anxious about them—a proposition to remove competition in star-route contracts.

And let us see how far we should follow the recommendation of the Post-Office Department. The Department has sought here for some years to get Congress to strike out that provision and remove competition entirely, placing in the hands of the Post-Office Department the power to let star-route contracts to persons who must agree to perform personally the service and who must live on the route. Notwithstanding the fact that the Second Assistant Postmaster-General stated that upon a test it was found that on 56 per cent of the star routes in this country there was no local

bidder, and on the other 44 per cent, if the local bid had been accepted, it would have increased the amount of the star-route contracts 50 per cent—in the face of that the Post-Office Department advocates the elimination of that provision of law providing for competition in the bidding for star-route service.

The Post-Office Committee is confronted with these propositions. Members of Congress are naturally timid preceding an election, and particularly preceding a Presidential election. These propositions involve an increased expenditure of from fifteen to twenty-five million dollars annually. No man can accurately determine the exact amount. If they come to this House, they will all come together. You might as well meet this question like men. You can not deal with this proposition in detail. If you want to do what you term an "act of justice" to the highest paid officials in the Post-Office Department, then you must extend your action down along the whole line.

Let me say one word to the Republican party as represented by members on this floor. Can you afford to go to the country, particularly on the eve of an election, with an increase of salaries along the line amounting to from fifteen to twenty-five million dollars on your Post-Office appropriation bill? And let me say to gentlemen on the other side of the House, who claim that they are going to have control of the next Congress, can you afford to have this increase placed upon you, which you can not shake off? It is true that you can now condemn the Republican party for extravagance, as you did after the Fifty-first Congress; but when you came together in the Fifty-second Congress, you found that you could not shake off the increases that had been placed upon the Government.

I do not desire to stop Congress from doing what it wants to do. Sometimes Congress tries to deceive the country; sometimes Congress tries to deceive itself. It is a well-known fact that there have been petitions presented to the Speaker of this House in days gone by containing more than 300 names of members of this House; yet when the Speaker asked the membership of the House generally as to whether they were agonizing to pass those measures, the general reply was "That is with you; we do not care."

Your Post-Office Committee thought it advisable to restore in a measure the salaries that existed fifteen years ago in this service. And, mind you, these men are paid to-day as much as they were in 1884. And no man can contend that the prices of articles which these men consume are higher to-day or that wages throughout the country are higher to-day than they were in 1884 or for six or seven years succeeding that date; and of these men who are now pressing for an increase of salary all along the line, many of them back in the days when greenbacks were worth but 70 cents on the dollar were content to fill these places, but now, when our money is worth more than the money of any nation on the earth, they have suddenly discovered that they are underpaid. The trend of wages in this country has been on the whole downward for the past twenty years; the tendency of the salaries of Government officials has been upward.

Mr. HOPKINS. If that is true as to clerks that get \$1,000 and under, why is it not equally true of assistant division superintendents, who, according to this bill as I see, have their salaries increased \$200 a year? Why is it not equally true of chief clerks, whose salaries under this bill are also increased \$200 a year? And why is it not equally true of clerks of class 5, whose salaries are increased \$100 a year, and clerks of class 4, whose salaries are increased \$50 a year?

Mr. LOUD. Now, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois—and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], who has agonized to-day a good deal over an amendment offered here in good faith, upon which any gentleman could have raised a point of order if he had wanted to—that in my opinion—I speak only for myself—all men are not worth the same amount of money. We did go beyond the present law in increasing the salaries of chief clerks, first, because there never was such an office as a chief clerk; and the service within the last few years has grown to such an extent that the chief clerk of a line has in many instances charge of three or four hundred men.

Now, we took 748 clerks and put them up to \$1,400, the maximum salary allowed by law. The committee thought that, as we had increased the men, it was but proper and just that those having charge of the men should have higher salaries. That proposition was subject to a point of order. The gentleman from Minnesota could have made it; he did not have the nerve to do so.

He did not fool me any when he was parleying with me here.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will you now, after the proposition that I have presented is disposed of, afford me an opportunity to let you know whether I have the nerve or not?

Mr. LOUD. If you want to raise the point of order against this whole paragraph, I am perfectly willing that it shall go out. You need not worry about that.

Mr. TAWNEY. I should like to know why you did not increase the salaries of the remainder of class 5?

Mr. LOUD. I will tell you why. This segregation was drawn by a man who, I assume, knows his business a great deal better than I know it. This segregation was drawn by the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service upon certain suggestions from our committee that we could afford to increase the salaries this year some, but that we could not afford to go to the extreme limit.

Now, if the gentleman will keep his seat a moment, I will be perfectly fair and frank with everybody. I stated to him—the gentleman evidently did not hear me, because he was too anxious to interrupt—that the suggestion was made to the General Superintendent; and I will relieve him from any responsibility, because I think he would be very glad to see every man in his service receive \$1,800 or \$2,400 a year. He gets \$3,500 himself, more than any man occupying a similar position under the United States Government, and can afford to be very generous. He has a large heart, a large salary, and feels kindly toward mankind, especially postal clerks.

Now, all the men in class 5 do not do similar work. The General Superintendent told me—and I suppose he told me the truth—that he had taken out all of the night runs and all of the hard runs, and he thought this was a fair point on which to make the division, and hence we increase those \$100. He did say to me that there was a great distinction between those two classes that we have created here, and the very bill that the gentleman from Minnesota proposes makes that distinction more marked. If you know what that bill does contain, you have taken this very character of men yourself and made a distinction of salary of \$200 a year, and yet you seek to criticize the Post-Office Committee because they have made a distinction here or but \$100.

The gentleman has claimed that we did not do what was right in increasing the salaries of class 4b. We did increase the salaries of a portion of class 4, just the same as we did in classes 5 and 4, because all of the men in each of those classes do not do the same work. That is just what you propose to do in your bill, only you make the distinction more marked.

The General Superintendent told us that these men in class 4 were not all performing the same character of service or the same amount of service, and he picked out of that number of about 1,600, 938 men who were performing extraordinary service above the others. Oh, there is more equity in this bill than the gentleman imagines.

Now, when it comes down to the lower classes, we could not increase their salaries without infringing upon the law; and permit me to say, personally, I do not think their salaries should be increased. Let us see what the railway mail clerk is receiving. His minimum salary is \$800 a year. In six months he goes into the \$900 class, or if he has been a substitute for six months he goes into the \$900 class at once. Do you understand? If he has been on the substitute list under the present regulation for six months, he receives his appointment at \$900, and almost immediately at the end of one year he goes into the \$1,000 class. I ask, in God's name, what vocation is there in this world where a man can go to work and at the end of one year receive a thousand dollars?

The gentleman says there are no increases. Let me call his attention to the fact that this bill carries \$600,000 more of increases than ever were made for the Railway Mail Service before. Yet the gentleman tells this House there is but \$147,000 of increase, and he agonizing for a million. In this estimate the gentleman has lost sight of the fact that the General Superintendent has estimated that men will go up; that is, that men will go from class 1 to 2, from class 2 to 3, from class 3 to 4, and from class 4 to 5, as they do under the present regulation, and there is where the money goes.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that I care to talk longer upon this subject. I do not see the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] here. Is he present?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yes; "the gentleman" is here.

Mr. LOUD. I want to say to the gentleman that with great emphasis he laid much stress upon the fact that no man could bring here a letter carrier who was in favor of the provision to which he refers. Now, let me say that I could bring a great many.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Produce one.

Mr. LOUD. Why, I can not produce a letter carrier here now. The gentleman well knows that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The Department will not let one come here.

Mr. LOUD. I do not think they could come on the floor of the House under our rules. You are daring me to do a thing that you know can not be done.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Do you mean to tell me that a letter carrier dare not express his convictions with regard to this matter?

Mr. LOUD. Well, the gentleman is the special champion of labor organizations throughout this country.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I do not claim to be anything of the kind.

Mr. LOUD. I assume that men who are members of labor organizations will take one position personally and another posi-

tion when they are speaking through their organizations. Let me say to the gentleman that no less a personage than the general superintendent of the free-delivery service, who was an attendant upon the annual meeting of the Letter Carriers' Association, came back to me and said, "The general consensus of opinion—I can not say it is unanimous, but the general consensus, so far as I am able to ascertain it—is in favor of this proposition," a proposition, let me say, which our Postal Commission has been discussing ever since its appointment. Our commission had many people before it, talked with many carriers personally, and personally I have never yet found a carrier who opposed this proposition.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Did you have a carrier before your committee?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, yes; we had quite a number.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Did you print the hearings? I should like to see the name of one of them.

Mr. LOUD. The hearings are in print. The gentleman knows all about that, and does not care to take my time on that, and I have referred to what the Postal Commission has done in a very small degree, as the gentleman knows.

Now, that amendment was offered here yesterday on my own personal responsibility. There was no secrecy about it. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD], who I believe is the friend of the carriers, as well as the gentleman from New York—for that seems to have been his special field ever since he has been a member of Congress—the gentleman from Massachusetts knew what the provision was.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I was not here when it was brought up. I was in committee at work.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD] was here, and the good sense of the gentleman from Massachusetts, at least at first blush, told him that that was good legislation and was what should be done.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will allow me just here, I only yielded to allow that proposition to go into the bill because of the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] said that the proposition was satisfactory to the letter carriers.

Mr. LOUD. I made that statement yesterday, and I make it again to-day.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to state at this time—

Mr. CUMMINGS. On behalf of the letter carriers' representatives, I deny it.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. The representatives of the letter carriers here in Washington have waited upon me, and say that they are absolutely and totally opposed to that proposition, and they want it stricken out, and I propose at the proper time, if I can get consent, to ask that that thing be done.

Mr. LOUD. It is not so much what one letter carrier wants or what they all want as it is a question whether it is a good business proposition—that Congress should determine whether it is a good business proposition or whether somebody wants it.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman—

Mr. LOUD. I have but a few minutes left. There is not a member on the floor of this House but what knows that this is a proper thing to do.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Here is one who does not.

Mr. LOUD. The letter carriers of this country do not work and can not work under an eight-hour schedule more than seven hours and twenty minutes a day. Let me say to the gentleman, although, of course, he is much closer to them than I am, more than a hundred have told me that on some days they were compelled to make such speed in order to come within the time that they were exhausted, while on other days they had plenty of time at their disposal; and they thought, and the Department thinks, that if they were permitted to deliver their mail and complete the delivery, if it took ten, fifteen, twenty, or thirty minutes over the eight hours on one day, no one would be seriously injured and the people would get their mail.

But it is a common occurrence now that on certain days of the week mail must be brought back to the office because they can not deliver it on some trip in the time stipulated. The Department do not and would not take any unfair advantage of them. The gentleman laid some stress on the fact that they might be compelled to work on Sundays. They are now, permit me to say. The gentleman represents some 1,500 or 1,800 letter carriers in New York, each of whom has a vote. If they wanted them to work on Sundays, they can compel them to work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. They are not enforcing it there.

Mr. LOUD. Oh, yes; they are. The amendment went in in such shape that I supposed it was the unanimous wish of Congress. Yesterday, I believe it was; to-day somebody has heard from a carrier, and he has changed his mind. Yesterday it was



wise legislation, and to-day it can not go, because you have heard from the carriers.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Because it was put in under false pretenses.

Mr. LOUD. It was not put in under false pretenses. Yesterday it seemed to be the unanimous wish. And let me say to you in perfect good faith that I have not heard a single carrier yet object to it.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. The representatives of the carriers' organization object to it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Is this not distinctly a violation of the provision of the eight-hour law passed in 1888?

Mr. LOUD. I do not know in what respect. It is simply provided that they shall not work in excess of forty-eight hours in the six days. If they work on Sundays under the amendment—

Mr. CUMMINGS. They do not.

Mr. LOUD. I read the provision to you. The Post-Office Department to-day can under the law work these carriers eight hours on Sundays if they see fit to do so. The provision is simply that they may work them eight and a half hours one day and seven and a half hours another.

When I was in New York I talked with many of the carriers, and they said that "Saturday afternoon is light, and we have very little to do. We would like to get Saturday afternoon off if we could work half an hour more three, four, or five days in order to have Saturday afternoon off." There is no man here, I believe, that would not rather work a little while longer Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in order that he might have half a day off on Saturday.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. If that plan is carried out, how would the mail be distributed on Saturday afternoon?

Mr. LOUD. In many of the large cities but a small amount of business is done on Saturdays. There is in many cities no business done whatever in the afternoon during the summer. Ninety-nine per cent of the business houses are closed up and nothing going on; and yet the carrier must sit around his eight hours, with nothing to do, and on Monday he can not deliver all the mail.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Are people living in residences not to be considered, or are business people only to be considered?

Mr. LOUD. Oh, they would be considered, and get their mail. Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I desire to call attention to the gentleman's amendment. It provides that the carriers can be worked any number of hours that may be required by the needs of the service. In the latter part of his amendment it states:

If any letter carrier is employed for a greater number of hours than forty-eight hours during the working days in any week, he shall be paid extra for the same in proportion to the salary fixed by law.

And it says nothing about the extra hours on Sunday.

Mr. LOUD. Well, they can not anticipate that the post-office will work them more than now.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. There is no provision here if they do work them.

Mr. LOUD. We must assume that they would be reasonable.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It was not reasonable after the passage of the law.

Mr. LOUD. Well, now let me say that perhaps I know as much as the gentleman does on that subject, for at the time the overpay question first came up for consideration I was a postal employee, and of the more than three millions paid for overtime much was paid for the time that letter carriers lay around the office and were not working.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And were they not paid in accordance with the judgment of the court?

Mr. LOUD. Why, yes; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And the Department forced them to go to the court to get what was theirs under the law.

Mr. LOUD. The men were not working, and the Department did not think they ought to be paid; but the court held they were working if in the office; and out of that came an order of the Department which was unfortunate for the carriers. It forced them into the cold in the winter, because if they permitted them to remain in the warm room they would go to the Court of Claims and charge for the time that they were there.

Mr. CUMMINGS. A printer has to stay in the office until he gets copy.

Mr. LOUD. I do not think I have anything further to say. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing, if the gentleman from New York wants to raise the point of order against that amendment, that we should go back to it, and let it go out on a point of order. If the friends of the letter carriers do not want this provision here I am perfectly willing that it should go out on the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will

give way for a request for unanimous consent that that may be done, I will raise the point of order.

Mr. LOUD. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Then I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that we may go back to that paragraph.

Mr. LOUD. Wait until we get through with this paragraph. I do not know that I have anything further, Mr. Chairman, to say to the committee. I feel justified in what the committee has presented on this bill, not only on behalf of the railway mail clerks, but on behalf of the post-office clerks. We have gone as far as we thought it was wise to go at this time.

Mr. TAWNEY and Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may go back to the paragraph in the bill where the amendment was offered—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is that we can not hear what the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying.

Mr. MAHON. The regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is finishing the debate already fixed by the House on this paragraph. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this can be done better after debate on this paragraph is finished.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Very well, Mr. Chairman, I will wait.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not care to occupy the floor for three minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not know, but what I have to say I can not say in three minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, during the debate I have heard a great deal about the cost of this service, but I have not heard a word about justice. I think all agree with me that too often very much is said about cost and too little about justice and fairness. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is a fair provision. It is founded upon justice and should be passed because in it the railway mail clerks are treated precisely as the post-office and other clerks in the Departments are treated. A clerk is not eligible to that title until he is paid \$1,000, the lowest rate of compensation. The next class is \$1,200, the next \$1,400, the next \$1,600, and the next \$1,800.

Now, why shall we place the clerks in the Departments, who work from 9 in the morning until 4 in the afternoon, with a half an hour for lunch, on classified salaries from \$1,000 to \$1,800, and put mail clerks, into whose work enters the element of danger, upon the lower salaries now paid? I can not understand wherein lie fairness and justice in such an arrangement. It seems to me that men who travel upon railroads day and night are certainly as worthy the consideration of this House as the clerks in the Departments of Washington, who work in pleasant rooms during pleasant hours.

The civil service came into life in 1881 by covering Departments in Washington. It did not then cover the Railway Mail Service. Under the first Cleveland Administration these railway clerks were thrown out and new men given their places, resulting in chaos. The mails were improperly delivered and everything was in confusion. In 1889 it was absolutely necessary to cover this branch of the service by civil service in order to keep trained and disciplined clerks in postal cars as well as in the Departments. It was demonstrated that the mail service demanded men skilled in the work and that such skill could come only by long training.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] said yesterday that the doors of every Department were crowded with people willing to come in and do the work for less than they are now receiving. Gentlemen, that is true of doors in front of every dry goods establishment and every factory throughout the country. There is a waiting list of hundreds of people willing to go into the factories and stores and work for less than those employed.

Mr. TALBERT. I do not know that I took the position that there were men willing to do the work for less money; my remark, I believe, was that they would gladly accept the salary and do the same laborious work.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I understood the gentleman to say that they were willing to do the work for less money.

Mr. TALBERT. Possibly I did say that. If I did not, I will say so now. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. But this is no argument why those at work should not be paid proper wages and placed upon an equality with others doing no better grade of work. It takes time to discipline and organize a working force, whether it be in the dry-goods business or in a Government Department, before a body of men can be made of the highest use. Indifferent, careless, lazy men must be weeded out and the worthy molded by education and experience into a company of good workers. This takes time and costs money; but after this process such a corps is worth much more than an undisciplined and an unselected throng at the door of a private business establishment or a Government Department. A man with a hoe is one thing; a man with a hoe who has learned to use it is quite another.

The railway mail clerks, next to the soldiers of our Army, are the best organized and disciplined body of men in the Government service, and, except that of the soldiers, their work is the most tiresome and dangerous, while its character is fully up to the standard of many clerical positions. They must pass a civil-service examination as difficult as that submitted to a first-class clerk, and promotion must come by hard, continuous service, good habits, and fidelity. Does any reason exist, therefore, why such men should not receive the pay and be entitled to opportunities for promotion the same as men in the Departments? House bill No. 2 only places them on an equality with Department clerks.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] asked me why I do not cite the salaries paid to railway postal clerks in London. I want to read from an article written by the gentleman referred to, Mr. V. J. Bradley, who was in London and Europe with the distinguished chairman of this committee:

It is to be noted that all promotions are based upon the length of time in the service, good conduct of course being presupposed. An ordinary postal clerk who would be on duty four-fifths of the time in an average year would secure a subsistence allowance, at 75 cents per trip, of about \$219 per annum. His minimum salary, plus the subsistence allowance at the beginning, would be \$479 per annum; and his maximum salary, plus the subsistence allowance, would be \$1,019 per annum.

Just the average salary of a railway postal clerk in the United States who, as General Shallenberger says, is doing as much work as two railway postal clerks in England perform—that is to say, the Government of Great Britain pays \$2,000 for the same service for which the Government of the United States pays \$1,000.

The hours of duty and the amount of work performed are apparently much easier than in the United States. For example, night work is limited to seven hours per day, and day work to eight hours per day. Any service over this allows of overtime claim of one and a quarter rates for all time over forty-eight hours a week. Sunday work and work on Christmas and Good Friday counts one and a half rates. The employees who have been over five years in the service get an annual vacation of twenty-one working days; those of less than five years' service get a vacation of fourteen working days. The employees also have a sick leave for six months with pay, if necessary; but there is a medical investigation if an employee is absent over nine days on account of sickness in any one year. They all receive in due course a free pension of as many sixtieths of the last salary held as the employee has had years of service, but not exceeding forty-sixtieths.

The gentleman from California has tried to scare the Republicans of this House to induce them to vote against this proposition. He tries to frighten them by calling their attention to the fact that we are on the eve of a Presidential election, and he tries to make it appear that gentlemen who advocate this proposition do so because an election is coming and they want the assistance of railway postal clerks. Why, sir, the gentleman knows as well as every other member of this House that there is only one class of Government employees that are unable to exert any political influence, and that class is the railway postal clerk. Nine-tenths of these men do not vote at all. They can not vote. What opportunities have they to exert any political influence, shut up as they are in their box cars from morning till night and from night till morning?

No, Mr. Chairman, those of us who favor this proposition do not do so for the purpose of securing the political influence of the railway postal clerks, but for the purpose of doing an act of justice, simple justice, by giving to these men a sufficient allowance of salary to enable them to maintain themselves and their families and to educate their children as other employees of the Government are able to do with the salaries they receive. When on duty these men are away from their homes and their families half the time. They are obliged to pay the expenses incident to such enforced absence. Why, sir, there are men sitting here at the front doors of the different Departments to see that members of Congress and Senators are not admitted into the presence of the heads of the Departments unannounced, who are receiving larger compensation than the average salary paid to the railway mail clerks, the custodians of the people's property, and who on entering this service, take their lives in their own hands. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. On the point of order I submit that the provision to which my proposition is offered as an amendment is itself out of order—is obnoxious to the rule. But it has been passed; it is before the Committee of the Whole; and that being so, it is competent and entirely proper to amend it.

I read from Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents:

A proposition which is before the House, even though of such a nature as to have been ruled out on a point of order, had one been made, may be projected by amendment.

On June 14, 1884, the House was considering Senate amendments to the Post-Office appropriation bill, among which was the following:

"For special facilities on trunk lines, \$185,000."

It was moved to recede and concur in this amendment with an amendment making the sum \$250,000.

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order that this amendment was not in order.

The Speaker held: While the Chair supposes there is no permanent provision of law authorizing this expenditure, still the proposition to expend a certain amount of money for that purpose is now properly before the House; and the Chair thinks that the proposition, being properly before the House, is amendable without regard to the rule applying to an original amendment proposed in the House. In other words, as an illustration, if the Committee on Appropriations should report a bill containing within it a provision not strictly authorized by law—

Which is identical with this proposition—

amendments proposed to such a proposition should not be ruled out upon a point of order, because the subject upon which they are predicated, being virtually before the House, is a legitimate subject of amendment, either by increasing or diminishing the amount of appropriation. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this proposition comes directly within that ruling. Here is a proposition increasing the salaries of certain railway postal clerks, providing for an entirely new classification, different from existing law. It is obnoxious to the rule, but has been passed, and is properly before the House. My amendment simply seeks to strike out a part of that reclassification and amend the proposition. I submit that the amendment is in order.

Mr. LOUD. I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. LOUD. Then I withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no doubt that the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is correct, that where a committee on a general appropriation bill undertakes to legislate in violation of the rule the Committee of the Whole has the right either to make the point of order or, passing the point of order, has the right to perfect that legislation by amendment.

It must, however, be perfected by some amendment or proposition that is germane to the paragraph to which the amendment is offered.

The Chair does not think that in the paragraph under consideration there is any reclassification. There is a change of existing law with respect to at least one salary, but so far as classification is concerned there is no change of existing law. That is to say, the salaries in the classes which are mentioned in the paragraph are all as to amount within the limit allowed by existing law.

It is perfectly competent under existing law to authorize salaries at one rate to a portion of a class and salaries at another rate to another portion of that class, and that is all that is attempted to be done here. There is no reclassification. The terms "a" and "b," as used in the paragraph, are used simply for the purpose of convenience, and they may be stricken out without affecting the legislation in any respect. So that, so far as classification is concerned, there is, in the judgment of the Chair, no new legislation in this paragraph. There is new legislation, however, with respect to the increase of salaries outside of the classes named, and this makes the paragraph amendable, provided the amendment offered is germane.

Now, the subject-matter of this paragraph is simply an appropriation for salaries to certain Government employees, recognized by law. The amendment offered is an independent bill now pending before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, entitled "A bill to reclassify postal clerks and prescribe their salaries," and it undertakes to establish an entirely new system. The provisions of the bill, after the first paragraph, perhaps, have no relation to reclassification or increase of salaries, but have relation to the duties of the Postmaster-General and to the duties of employees and to a great many details that are not germane to the paragraph now under consideration. To be admissible the amendment must be germane as a whole. It is not so germane. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LOUD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. DALZELL, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10301)



making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there shall be printed 4,500 copies of Notes on the Spanish-American War, Office of Naval Intelligence, Navy Department, with accompanying papers and documents, of which 1,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for the use of the Navy Department—

to the Committee on Printing.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:  
To Mr. BARTLETT, indefinitely, on account of sickness.  
To Mr. WHITE, for three days, on account of important business.  
And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for education of children in Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs to the station at San Marcos, Tex.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the chairman of the Industrial Commission, transmitting the report on prison labor—to the Committee on Labor, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of David A. Cleage and L. W. Rose, administrators of estate of David Cleage, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3430) to increase the efficiency of the Subsistence Department of the United States Army, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1151); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10149) providing for commutation of transportation and subsistence of officers and enlisted men when honorably discharged from the service of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1152); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7844) to provide for the revision and codification of the permanent and general laws of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1153); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9236) to grant a pension

to Herman S. Soules, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1120); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4577) to increase the pension of John D. Craig, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1121); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8235) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dennison, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1122); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8235) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Metcalf, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1123); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4627) granting a pension to Rachel M. Harvey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1124); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6091) granting a pension to Mary A. Fullerton, widow of Hugh S. Fullerton, first lieutenant of Company C, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1125); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10719) granting a pension to Elizabeth S. Seymour, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1126); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9752) granting a pension to Margaret Thornberry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1127); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2503) to pension Frances A. Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1128); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEDGE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6494) to increase the pension of Dorus M. Fox, late colonel Twenty-seventh Michigan Infantry Volunteers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1129); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4086) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lockwood, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1130); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9207) granting a pension to John F. Kelly, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1131); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5508) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Taylor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1132); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3063) for the relief of Evan M. Woodward, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1133); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8114) granting a pension to Annie E. Bell and Florence M. Bell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1134); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9775) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hempstead, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1135); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3267) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Moor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1136); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10612) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hardin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1137); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9424) granting an increase of pension to George Cronk, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1138); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEDGE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9898) granting a pension to Edward J. Trussler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1139); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3513) awarding a pension of \$50 per month to Edwin Hurlburt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1140); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4355) granting a pension to Oren E. Barber, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1141); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 289) granting a pension to John B. Turchin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1142); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4030) granting a pension to Helen M. Glenny, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1143); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Washington Baker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1144); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3075) granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Blaisdell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1145); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2983) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Lynn, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1146); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEDGE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3380) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton K. Williams, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1147); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Kearney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1148); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEDGE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Perry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1149); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 682) granting an increase of pension to Wilhelmina Hippler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1150); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 10997) to amend section 4414, Title LII, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 10998) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to purchase armor for battle ships by contract, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 10999) to provide for the perpetuation and preservation of the archives and public records of

the several States and Territories and of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DE VRIES: A bill (H. R. 11000) providing a means of acquiring title to two groves of Sequoia gigantea, in the State of California, with a view to making national parks thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 11001) to control corporations and associations organized or conducting business for the purpose of controlling or monopolizing manufacturing and trade, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11002) in relation to monopolies, trusts, combines, devices, contracts, and combinations in the form of trusts or otherwise—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11015) to determine and fix the necessary proof and procedure to be required of claimants for pensions, and to establish the proper officers to determine the rating thereof—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOONAN: A resolution (H. Res. 238) for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the closing of the American Steel and Wire Company's works—to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 11003) for the relief of Joseph Ramsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 11004) granting a pension to Delila F. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 11005) for the relief of Wesley Rankins, of Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11006) to correct the military record of David Hurlburt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 11007) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 11008) authorizing the Solicitor of the Treasury to quitclaim and release title and interest of the United States to Mrs. Lutie M. Nowlin—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 11009) granting a pension to Martha J. Speelman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11010) granting an increase of pension to James H. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11011) granting an increase of pension to David M. Gilman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 11012) granting an increase of pension to Robert Hendry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11013) granting a pension to Susan E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 11014) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John R. Henderson, administrator of Michael C. Henderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 11016) granting a pension to Stephen Chapin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of D. W. McVey and other citizens of Rising Sun, Md., favoring the passage of the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petitions of Lament Lagace, of North Lyndon, Me.; Andrew Ouellette, Joseph Ouellette, and Didier Ouellette, of Caribou, Me., urging the passage of the Grout bill to increase the tax on oleomargarine, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition of John H. Jackson Post, No. 689, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Cochranville, New London, Parker Ford, and Nottingham, Pa., and citizens of Delaware County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill prohibiting the sale of liquor in Army cantons, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George K. Barney and other farmers of Chester and Delaware counties, Pa., in favor of the Grout bill



to increase the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph Ramsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARMACK: Petition of James L. Coleman, of Chambers County, Ala., relating to his claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of druggists and citizens of Racine, Wis., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of Letter Carriers' Association of Asheville, N. C., praying for an increase of salary of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of substitute letter carriers of Des Moines, Iowa, in favor of House bill No. 1051, relating to grading of substitute letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petitions of citizens of Asbury Park and State of New Jersey and surfmen of the Life-Saving Service, for legislation to increase the terms of service and pay of the Life-Saving Service along the Atlantic coast and Great Lakes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Green McCurtain, chief of the Choctaw Nation, and D. H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory, in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 9995, as affecting the treaty with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of Thomas Maning Post, No. 57, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: Paper relating to the claim of Wesley Rankins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: Petition of members of Capital Grange, No. 18, Patrons of Husbandry, State of Delaware, for State control of imitation dairy products as provided in House bill No. 3717—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Board of Trade of Oakland, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill No. 10374, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: Petition of the teachers and students of the Kansas State Normal School, favoring the passage of House bill No. 5457, known as the Spalding bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany House bill No. 10987, for the relief of F. H. Driscoll—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: Affidavit of Hon. William T. Malster to accompany House bill No. 9328, in relation to a certain claim—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCUDDER: Petitions of H. A. Barnum Post, No. 656, and George Huntman Post, No. 50, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolution of Conference of the Evangelical Association of New York, relating to divorce laws, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal churches of Sheakleyville, Greenville, and Jamestown, Pa., and United Presbyterian Church of Sharon, Pa., for the passage of a bill to forbid liquor selling in canteens and in the Army, Navy, and Soldiers' Homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky (by request): Petition of Downey Post, No. 122, Department of Kentucky, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany House bill No. 8241, to increase the pension of James W. Black, of Belvidere, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 8945, increasing the pension of William G. Winslow, of Friend, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of Darby Grange, No. 779, of West Jefferson, Ohio, Patrons of Husbandry, in support of House bill No. 3717, to control the sale of imitation dairy products; also in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, to vest additional authority in the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the National Association of Railway Postal Clerks, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the enactment of House bill No. 10035, to amend the postal laws relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.\*

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 26, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. ALLEN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

## VESSEL SLOOP BETSEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law, filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, set out in the annexed findings by the court, relating to the vessel sloop *Betsy*, Benjamin Rhodes, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

## MILITARY OFFICERS IN CUBA AND PORTO RICO.

Mr. BACON. Yesterday there came to the Senate a reply from the Secretary of War in response to the inquiry of the Senate as to payments made to certain officers of the United States. It was read at length at the desk, and I supposed from that fact it would be printed in the RECORD, and therefore made no request to that effect. I am informed, however, that under such circumstances an executive communication is not printed in full in the RECORD without a request, and I now make the request that that reply may appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the communication from the Secretary of War touching the pay of certain officers in Cuba and Porto Rico be printed at length in the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. And as a document.

Mr. BACON. It has already been ordered printed as a document.

Mr. COCKRELL. All right, then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## EXTRA COMPENSATION PAID TO ARMY OFFICERS IN CUBA AND PORTO RICO.

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, April 25, 1900.

To the Senate of the United States:

I have the honor to reply to the following resolution, dated April 21, 1900, received April 23:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to report to the Senate the following information:

"First. Whether any officer of the Army of the United States who is now, or who has been, on duty either in Cuba or Porto Rico since the date of the declaration of war by the United States against Spain has received any compensation for any service of any kind whatsoever other than the compensation to which such officer of the Army is, as such, entitled by law to receive as his salary and allowances.

"Second. If any officer of the United States Army has, during said period, while on duty in either Cuba or Porto Rico, received from any source any compensation other than that which he is, as such officer, entitled by law to receive as his salary and allowances: what is the name and rank of each such officer, and what the amount or amounts received by him; the date or dates on which each said amount was so received; on what account the said amount or amounts were paid; by whom said payment or payments were authorized, and out of what fund or funds said payments were made."

Pursuant to the orders of the Secretary of War, dated respectively March 1, 1899, April 19, 1899, and May 9, 1899, copies of which are annexed hereto, allowances have been paid to four officers of the Army who have been required to live in the city of Habana and to perform important civil functions in connection with the administration of the government of Cuba, as follows:

To the military governor of Cuba, at the rate of \$7,500 per year.

To the military governor of Habana, at the rate of \$5,000 per year.

To the collector of customs for the island of Cuba, at the rate of \$1,800 per year.

To the treasurer of the island of Cuba, at the rate of \$1,800 per year.

These payments were in addition to the salary and allowances which the said officers were entitled as such to receive out of the Treasury of the United States. I am not aware of any other payments of the character described in the resolution to any officers in Cuba. I annex hereto a report received some months since from the Headquarters, Division of Cuba, showing that none other have been made. The payments have been made monthly from the dates stated in said orders until the present time. The precise dates of payment will appear in an itemized statement of receipts and expenditures now in course of preparation under a previous resolution of the Senate. Payments to the military governor of Habana will cease with the termination of that office on the 1st day of May, 1900. The names and ranks of the officers receiving the payments were, as military governor of Cuba, Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, until the 13th day of December, 1899, and Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, U. S. V., since that time; as military governor of Habana, Brig. Gen. William Ludlow; as collector of customs for Cuba, Maj. Tasker H. Bliss; as treasurer of the island of Cuba, Maj. E. F. Ladd, U. S. V.

No allowances have been made to any officer in Porto Rico other than the statutory salary and allowances out of the Treasury of the United States.

The payments specified were made out of the revenues of the island of Cuba, on account of government thereof, and they were made on that account for the reason that it was impossible for the said officers to properly perform the necessary duties pertaining to their positions without the expenditure of the full amount of such allowances in addition to their statutory salaries and allowances out of the Treasury of the United States.

The aggregate of the payments thus made prior to the 1st day of the present month was \$17,441.66. The total receipts of the island of Cuba collected by these officers during the period covered by the aforesaid expenditure therefrom amounted to \$21,036,572.76, and the total disbursements under their direction amounted to \$19,280,512.21.